Facts Revealed by the Records

IN THE

So-called Investigation

OF THE

Rumors Abroad Concerning the Soundness in the Faith of Rev. Dr. Hay Watson Smith.

I. Facts Revealed as to the Appointment and Personnel of the Investigating Commission.

II. Facts Revealed by the Correspondence Between the Chairman of the Commission and the Rev. Dr. Hay Watson Smith.

III. Facts Revealed by the Minutes of the Commission and Communications in the Arkansas Gazette Relative to the Investigation.

IV. Facts Revealed by the Report of the Commission.

THE SITUATION CREATED AND THE ISSUES RAISED BY THESE FACTS

So long as the supply lasts, copies of this pamphlet may be had from its author on request.

IBR

MJA
64
M1724

The William Smith Morton Library

Union Presbyterian Seminary
Richmond, Virginia

Prefatory Note

In appendices I have given the Minutes of the Commission appointed to investigate the rumors abroad concerning Dr. Smith's soundness in the faith; the Report of said Commission to Arkansas Presbytery at its regular Spring Meeting, April 8-9, 1930;* minute relative to reception of Dr. Smith by Arkansas Presbytery in 1912; and a list of the documents constituting "The Record" in the case.

To have reproduced the entire correspondence between the Chairman and Dr. Smith, in addition to increasing the expense of this pamphlet, would have cumbered it with much irrelevant material. Where I have quoted the letters either of the Chairman or Dr. Smith, I have in every case either quoted the letter in full, or given so much of the letter as related to or threw any light upon the particular matter for which it was quoted.

To have included all the pamphlets that are a part of the record in the case would have involved a considerable expense. In the case of these, I have necessarily been obliged to limit myself to extracts, giving the context with sufficient fullness to prevent any misundering.

References to the Commission or the Presbytery in this paper, unless otherwise stated, are limited to the majority of the Commission and the majority of the Presbytery, the majority in each case having determined the action in these respective bodies.

Italics, except where otherwise stated, are always mine, and are designed to arrest attention upon the phrases or sentences italicized.

*The Minutes of the Commission and its Report are taken from *Minutes of the Arkansas Presbytery*, called meetings February 18th and March 6th; Spring meeting, Osceola, Arkansas, April 8-9, 1930. In the appendices the pages of the Minutes are given in [ ].

Abbreviations: BCO—Book of Church Order; *Min.*—Minutes of the Arkansas Presbytery April 8-9, 1930.

To the Reader

Dear reader:

Whoever you may be, whether minister, elder, deacon, man or woman, if you are a member of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (Southern Presbyterian Church), the matters discussed in this pamphlet concern you. This is so, because this pamphlet deals with matters that deeply concern the good name of your church, and of its office-bearers; and the truth for which it stands. This is true whatever may be your attitude toward what are sometimes crudely thought of as church controversies; or your attitude toward the specific matter discussed in this paper. I trust, therefore, that you will not permit yourself to say, "I have no time to read so long a pamphlet." If, however, that is your feeling, may I make a suggestion. It is this: the pamphlet is divided into two parts. The second of these is much shorter than the first, but that second part itself is divided into two sections. The second of these, as you will see, has to do with the issues that confront the church of which you are office-bearer or a member. That can be read in five minutes. It may be, after reading that, you will feel that your duty requires you to find the time or make the time to read the rest. But, if you do not, you will at least know the nature and gravity of the issues with which your church is confronted. After that, the responsibility for deciding whether you will or will not read the remainder of the pamphlet will be with you.

Yours in and for the truth of the gospel.

W. M. McPHEETERS.

March 27, 1934.
Decatur, Ga.,

PART I

FACTS REVEALED BY THE RECORDS IN THE SO-CALLED INVESTIGATION OF THE RUMORS ABROAD CONCERNING THE SOUNDNESS IN THE FAITH OF REV. DR. HAY WATSON SMITH.

Section I. Facts Revealed by Press Reports and Minutes of Commission, As to the Appointment and Personnel of the Commission.

1. Experience shows that in order to a fair and impartial investigation both those appointing and those constituting the personnel of a commission conducting an investigation affecting the character and official standing of a person should be above any suspicion of bias, either for or against the person whose conduct is under investigation, and also above any suspicion of bias for or against one outcome of the investigation as against another.

Press reports show that when the communication from the General Assembly ordering this investigation was brought before Arkansas Presbytery, a Mr. C. T. Coleman got the floor and moved that in compliance with the injunction of the General Assembly a commission of investigation be appointed, and nominated four persons to constitute said commission. They show that Mr. Coleman's resolution met with warm opposition; that thereupon Mr. Coleman asked to be allowed to confess his error in nominating the members of the Commission; and that, as the outcome of the whole discussion, his resolution was modified by adding to the Commission three additional members appointed by the moderator, the moderator himself being one of those nominated by Mr. Coleman.

And who is Mr. Coleman? He is an attorney of Little Rock, Ark., an elder in the Second Presbyterian Church of that city, of which Dr. Hay Watson Smith is the pastor, and is a brother-in-law of Dr. Smith.

In such cases, because of the close personal relations existing between them, the law presumes the presence in Mr. Coleman's breast of a bias in favor of his pastor and brother-in-law. The Minutes of the Commission show that of those nominated by Mr. Coleman one became the chairman of the Commission, and of those nominated

WILLIAM SMITH MORTON LIBRARY
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
& PRESBYTERIAN SCHOOL OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VA 23227-4597

by the moderator one was providentially detained from attending the meetings of the Commission; and that on all motions coming before the Commission, three of the four persons nominated by Mr. Coleman, uniformly voted together as against the remaining two appointed by the moderator of presbytery.

This means, of course, that the findings of the Commission were determined by those nominated by Mr. Coleman. Nor is this showing changed by the fact that the other nominee of the moderator, who, as already stated, was providentially prevented from being present at meetings of the Commission, requested that he be permitted to cast his vote for the report adopted by the majority. That this disregard by Arkansas Presbytery of the proprieties found necessary to insure an impartial judicial investigation constitutes a "disreputable and injurious" irregularity will hardly be denied.

2. Press reports further show that during the discussion of Mr. Coleman's motion, one of those whom he had nominated expressed himself as follows:

> "The Rev. _____, taking the floor in behalf of Mr. Coleman's resolution, urged that 'categorical questioning amounts to a heresy proceeding, which might have important reverberations throughout the church, leading even into disunion and schism.' Although Dr. _____ said he does not agree with the views of Dr. Smith, he was unwilling to see a man over sixty years of age and of exemplary life subjected to discipline unless the case were so flagrant that it could not be overlooked."—*Arkansas Gazette*, November 15, 1929.

> "Rev. _____ took the floor and declared (that) . . . he did not believe it (i. e. the question as to Dr. Smith's doctrinal soundness) was a proper question to come before the Arkansas Presbytery."—*Atlanta Journal*, November 13, 1929.

This means, of course, that while the matter was still under discussion, one of those nominated by Mr. Coleman frankly announced that he was opposed to the investigation and that his sympathies were with Dr. Smith.

Clearly, to include in the Commission one who had so expressed himself was so far forth prejudicial to a fair investigation and constitutes a "disreputable and injurious" irregularity. Accordingly,

at the very initiation of this investgation, we encounter irregularities that create a strong presumption against the impartiality of the findings of the Commission.

Section II. Facts Revealed by the Correspondence Between The Chairman of the Commission and Dr. Smith.

Experience has shown it to be indispensable to a fair and impartial investigation that during the progress of such an investigation those conducting it must not be exposed to influences that tend to create in their breasts a bias either for or against the person whose conduct is under investigation.

i. FACTS REVEALED AS TO THE INFLUENCES BROUGHT TO BEAR UPON THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION SUITED TO CREATE IN HIM A BIAS IN FAVOR OF DR. SMITH.

The correspondence between the chairman of the Commission and Dr. Smith shows:

1. That under date of February 1, 1930, Dr. Smith wrote to the chairman of the Commission as follows:

> "I have just read your letter to me and your letter to the members of the Commission. . . .
>
> "I saw that you had been called to Hot Springs. I sincerely hope that, if you accept the call, you will not sever your connection with the Commission. It would not be necessary for you to sever your connection with Arkansas Presbytery until after the report of the Commission has been finished. *I feel that as chairman of this commission, you are in a position to render a very great service to the entire Southern Presbyterian Church.*
>
> "I had rather hoped you would decline the call to Hot Springs because it will not be long, *I am confident, before you will be receiving calls to some of the largest churches in our Assembly.*"

And that under date of February 24, 1930, he (Dr. Smith) wrote to the chairman as follows:

> "The Elder from our Church, Mr. _____, at the recent called meeting of Presbytery said that he was under the impression that, in view of your coming withdrawal from Arkansas Presbytery, and your possible resignation from the Commission, he had reason to believe that things were being stacked

against me in the Presbytery. I had a similar intimation from another source.

"In view of this, Mr. _____ asked me to write to you and urge you *not* to sever your connection with the Commission, and I told him I would do so.

"However, you know the situation and after thinking it over, I do not feel that I would be justified in urging any particular course of action on your part. I am writing only because I promised Mr. _____ to do so. Whatever the Commission, or the Presbytery, does will be satisfactory to me. I may say, however, that I do not intend to allow myself to be put in a position that would be unjust to myself and to the views that I hold."

In view of the relations at the time existing between the chairman of the Commission and Dr. Smith, the impropriety of these letters is, I think, manifest. Why? Because the content of the letters was suited to create in the breast of the chairman a bias in favor of Dr. Smith: that is to say the chairman of the Commission would have to be very unlike other men, if such expressions of esteem and kindly regard for his interests, and such an estimate of his importance as a factor on the Commission did not awaken in his breast sentiments toward Dr. Smith that would make it exceedingly difficult for him to do anything that would be painful to the latter, or prejudicial to the interests and Christian character of the latter.

2. That under date of January 16, 1930, Dr. Smith wrote to the chairman of the Commission as follows:

"Dr. Mackintosh takes the view that I do concerning the doctrine of the two 'natures' of Christ. The same view is taken by the Presbyterian theologians, Dr. John Baillie, in his recent book, 'The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity,' and Dr. W. P. Paterson in his book, 'The Rule of Faith.'

"You will notice in my paper that I accept the main conclusions of what is known as the higher criticism. One of our ministers, Dr. _____, has an article in the *Union Seminary Review,* October, 1929, in which he accepts these conclusions without reservation."

The two things that need to be noted here are, first, that Dr. Smith did not and could not claim that the views of the scholars he cited are thouse taught in our Standards. Hence one effect of citing the view he ascribes to these scholars was to obscure and distract atten-

tion from the only issue with which the Commission had any concern. That issue was not: Are the teachings of our Standards and of all the great historic creeds out of accord with the Scriptures in their doctrine of the Person of Christ? For the Commission was not appointed to revise or to consider the necessity or propriety of revising the teachings of the creeds of Christendom or even of our own Standards upon this doctrine. The one and only issue before the Commission was: Does the evidence cited (or do the writings of Dr. Smith) create a strong presumption that Dr. Smith's views of the Person of Christ are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards?

The obvious effect, therefore, of citing the views of the scholars mentioned was to obscure the only real issue before the Commission and to distract its attention from that issue.

The other thing that needs to be noted is that in citing these scholars as holding the same view of the Person of Christ as he himself holds, Dr. Smith's purpose evidently was to use the prestige of their names to create in the members of the Commission a bias in favor of his view of the Person of Christ, even though he knew and the members of the Commission knew that his view of this doctrine is in contradiction to that taught in our Standards. Or, to put it more plainly, Dr. Smith was endeavoring to undermine the loyalty of the members of the Commission to our Standards, and to induce them, contrary to their bounden duty, to test the soundness of his (Dr. Smith's) doctrinal view regarding the Person of Christ not by its conformity or lack of conformity to the teachings of our Standards, but by its conformity to the view ascribed to Drs. Mackintosh, Baillie and Paterson.

ii. **FACTS REVEALED AS TO THE INFLUENCES BROUGHT TO BEAR UPON THE COMMISSION SUITED TO CREATE IN THE BREASTS OF ITS MEMBERS A BIAS IN FAVOR OF DR. SMITH.**

In a letter to Dr. Smith, dated January 7, 1930, paragraph 4, the chairman says:

> "In your letter today you mentioned the 'Auburn Affirmation' of 1924. As you will see from the enclosed copy of a letter to the members of the Commission, I have just mailed a copy to each member. They were sent from the Committee on Protestant

Liberties in the Presbyterian Church upon request of Dr. Walter I. Clarke of Philadelphia."

What needs to be noticed here is the fact that in placing the Auburn Affirmation in the hands of the Commission, its chairman had simply anticipated the suggestion and wish of Dr. Smith.

This raises the question: Why did Dr. Smith desire the Auburn Affirmation to go into the hands of the members of the Commission? Certainly, it was not to help them intelligently to decide whether the evidence in the case—evidence furnished by Dr. Smith's own writings—did or did not create a strong presumption of the truth of the reports that in certain specific particulars Dr. Smith was not conforming his teaching to the system of doctrine set forth in our Standards. Upon that issue, the Affirmation had no bearing: but that was the one and only issue before the Commission. And the only way to settle that question was to compare Dr. Smith's teachings with those of our Standards. What, then, was the purpose for which the Affirmation was put into the hands of the members of the Commission? If I may borrow a sonorous phrase from its Report, it was to enlighten the members of the Commission as to "a man's liberty in Christ," especially as it stands related to the obligations that a man assumes in connection with his ordination vows, the Auburn Affirmation, apparently, representing Dr. Smith's conception of a man's "liberty in Christ" in reference to such vows.

This is not the place to discuss the Auburn Affirmation. To do so would demand too much time and space, and would divert attention from the matter in hand. I must content myself with just two remarks. One is that the oftener I read it the more deeply I am convinced that its conception of Christian liberty in connection with subscription to the system of doctrine set forth in the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is intellectually absurd, historically false, ethically detestable and pernicious, and religiously blasphemous. Of more fundamental importance is the fact that in our church the significance of the ordination obligation is far less open to misconceptions than it is in the case of the Presbyteran Church in the U. S. A. For one thing, in our church the ordination obligation itself is perfectly explicit and is assumed not

merely by the answering of questions propounded to applicants for ordination, but by a written formula to which the applicant, after he has answered the questions, subscribes his name in writing. Further, happily for our church, it has up to this time avoided unions effected by means of ambiguous phrases that lend themselves easily to misconstruction. Accordingly, even if the doctrine of the Auburn Affirmation in regard to the significance of subscription were true for the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.—which it is not—still it would have no application whatever to our church.

But what needs to be borne in mind here is the fact that in putting the Auburn Affirmation into the hands of the members of the Commission, the chairman was bringing to bear upon them influences that tended to distract their attention from the only issue before them; undermine their loyalty to the truth; and bias them in favor of Dr. Smith.

iii. FACTS EVIDENCING THE EXISTENCE IN THE BREAST OF THE CHAIRMAN OF A BIAS IN FAVOR OF DR. SMITH.

1. In a letter dated March 17, 1930, from the chairman to Dr. Smith occur the following paragraphs:

> "My idea all along was that by a friendly conference with you we could come nearer getting hold of the real issues and then we would be more able to state them to the Presbytery for its consideration. *So far as I know, no member of the Commission has any idea of putting you upon an examination, much less challenging your views. As chairman of the Commission, I shall stand squarely and firmly against any sort of thing as this. As everyone knows, there are two sides to the controversy.* I had hopes that by a conference with you the Commission would see your side of it more clearly and be better able to recommend the right course for the Presbytery to take. You have information that the Commission needs to have in hand before reaching a decision. *As well as hearing your expression of views* on the Deity of Christ, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Sinfulness of Man, and the Saving Power of Christ, *I want the Commission to hear some of the irresponsible and insulting letters that you have received from men outside of the Synod of Arkansas.*
>
> "*I agree with you that this whole matter comes at an inopportune time. Had I been in the Assembly last spring I would have voted against any such investigation.* But now that

the Assembly and the Presbytery have acted, the only way that I can see for good Presbyterians to do is to face the issue squarely, state our views clearly, set the whole matter before the Church in definite terms and let the Church itself render its decision. *Then and only then can we tell where we are on these matters before us.*

"My prayer from the beginning has been *that no essential truth may be compromised and that no man's liberty in Christ shall be infringed* in the Presbyterian Church. If we are able to carry this matter to its conclusion without bitterness and without animosity, we shall write a new chapter in the history of the Church."

The statements here calling for special attention have been *italicized.*

Some of these statements are important as showing the confusion of thought, that is characteristic of the chairman, thus accounting for some of his unhappy mistakes. He says, for example, that he will stand clearly and firmly against any attempt to put Dr. Smith on examination, utterly unconscious that he himself in this very letter and paragraph is putting Dr. Smith on examination. What is an examination, but an effort to draw out from one his views upon some subject or other, and what else was the chairman aiming at when he asked for an expression of Dr. Smith's views on the Deity of Christ, the Inspiration of Scripture, the Sinfulness of Man, and the Saving Power of Christ. Again, when he says that he will stand squarely and firmly against any challenging of Dr. Smith's views, the chairman forgets that in this connection "to challenge" means to call in question. But how could the Commission discharge its duty and demand of him satisfactory explanations of the reports touching his doctrinal unsoundness without at least indirectly calling in question the soundness of Dr. Smith's views? And so when the chairman stresses the fact that there are two sides to the controversy which Dr. Smith has precipitated, he forgets that there is *only one right side* to it, and that sooner or later he and everybody else will have to line up for or against that side. There can be no neutrals in such controversies.

But, to come to the main issue. The chairman's bias for Dr. Smith is evidenced by his extreme concern for Dr. Smith's feelings

and interests; by his frank expression of opposition to the investigation; by his ambiguous but highly suggestive words "then and only then can we tell where *we are* on these matters before us;" by his use of the phrases "essential truths" and "no man's liberty in Christ," ideas upon which Dr. Smith insists so frequently and so earnestly; and *especially by his request for those "irresponsible and insulting letters."*

Here, again, let us ask what possible light could the chairman hope that these "irresponsible and insulting letters" would throw on the only issue that was before the Commission. Was he cunningly trying to bias them against Dr. Smith? Hardly. Was he consciously and deliberately endeavoring to bias them in favor of Dr. Smith? Hardly. What then? It seems probable that the letters to which he refers and which he himself may or may not have seen, but of which he had certainly heard, had awakened in his own breast a sympathy for Dr. Smith as a much-misrepresented and maligned man, and he simply wanted the members of the Commission to share in his sympathies for Dr. Smith. That is all. It evidently did not occur to him that to excite sympathy for Dr. Smith in their minds was a very poor way to secure an impartial judgment regarding the soundness of Dr. Smith's doctrinal views. But that, again, does not change any facts. And the fact is that what the chairman did was suited to distract the attention of the Commission from the one and only issue before it, and to bias them in favor of Dr. Smith.

Reaction of Dr. Smith to Foregoing Letter of Chairman.

In his reply (March 19, 1930) to the foregoing letter of the chairman, Dr. Smith says:

> "I have just read your letter, and I want to say that it is the *most reassuring communication* that I have had for some time."

Again in a letter of March 21, 1930, referring to the same letter of the chairman, Dr. Smith says:

> "I have read your letter of the 17th over two or three times very carefully. *It is a splendid letter.*"

The reaction of Dr. Smith to the chairman's letter of March 17, 1930, as shown by the passages cited, is the best evidence that I have

not read into the language of the chairman a significance not really in it.

2. On April 6th, we find the the chairman writing again to Dr. Smith as follows:

"The Commission of Arkansas Presbytery spent two days last week making the investigation ordered by the General Assembly. All except Dr. ____ were present and a very splendid spirit prevailed in all the deliberations. Dr. _____ was unable to be present on account of the illness of Mrs. ____.

"We were not able to finish the report or to reach a unanimous agreement as to our recommendations to Presbytery, but I was very much gratified that we were able to make the progress that we did. Mr. _____ and I were appointed to frame a tentative report for the Commission to be presented for their approval or modification at Osceola on Tuesday afternoon at four o'clock.

"In the meantime, if you could give me a little fuller statement of your views on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Sinfulness of Man, the Atoning work of Christ and Justification by Faith, it would help us a great deal.

"For instance, you believe that the Bible is a revelation from God in a sense different from that of other literature, do you not? In other words, you believe with us that the Scriptures are not the mere product of human beings, but of the spirit of God speaking through them, do you not? You could subscribe to the article in the Scottish Standards that the Bible is 'the supreme rule of faith and life,' could you not?

"Concerning the sinfulness of man, you believe that he is a sinner both by nature and by practice, do you not, and that he is not able to save himself apart from the mercy of God in Christ?

"Concerning the atoning work of Christ, you believe that He died the just for the unjust that He might bring us to God, do you not? You quote Dr. James Denney as expressing your views concerning Christ's person. Does he also express your views in substance on the death of Christ and its meaning?

"You believe also that man's justification is by faith rather than by his own good works, do you not?

"In my tentative report, I am stating these to be, in substance, your views, but I would like to have a definite confirmation from you before I present the tentative report to the Commission next Tuesday. If you could leave a statement on these

points at your office on Monday morning, I could get it on my way to Blytheville and have it with me at the meeting of the Commission. I expect to be passing through Little Rock Monday morning some time between nine and nine-thirty.

"Again expressing to you my heartiest good wishes and my confident expectation that the matters before us will be justly and honorably handled by the Presbytery, I am,"

Let the reader notice the form of the questions asked by the chairman. Each time the latter tries to put into Dr. Smith's mouth the answer that he (the chairman) desires the latter to make. Why does he do this? Clearly because the chairman feels that the answers he suggests will be in Dr. Smith's interests and create an impression favorable to Dr. Smith. Of course, this was a mistaken notion on the part of the chairman. His questions only show the chairman's incompetence for the task he had set himself. But they reveal as a mirror his benevolent desire to put Dr. Smith in a favorable light. Notice also the wheedling and coaxing tone of the chairman's questions. It reminds one of a weak but loving mother trying with honeyed persuasiveness to elicit from her *enfant terrible,* possessed of a stronger will than her own, some statements that will enable her to smooth over and put a better face on what the latter had previously said.

But, the conclusive evidence that the chairman has convinced Dr. Smith that he (Dr. Smith) had in the chairman one actually friendly to his (Dr. Smith's) interests is furnished by Dr. Smith's reply to the letter of the chairman just cited. It was written April 7, 1930, and reads:

"I want to say something more about a matter that I touched upon in my last letter to you, and that is, the utter futility of the sort of question and answer examination that I am being subjected to as a test of a man's fitness for the ministry—especially ministry in such an intelligent denomination as the Presbyterian.

"I have had a number of letters from ministers in our Church passing the severest criticism on me, and yet an examination of the records of these ministers in the Minutes of our Assembly shows that they have had scarcely any measure of success in their work. They would have no difficulty in entering any

Presbytery in the Southern Church, yet if our Church were dependent upon such ministers, it would stand still or die.

"But that is not the most serious aspect of the matter. Men who are consummate cranks, and men who are shockingly untruthful, would be received into any Presbytery in the Southern Church. I have read the writings of _____ and _____, both of whom declare that the earth is flat and stationary and that modern medical science is of the devil, yet both of these men would answer satisfactorily the questions usually asked of candidates for admission to Presbyteries.

"Rev. _____ is one of our missionaries in_____. A few weeks ago I had a letter from _____ in which he says: 'I have just had a letter from _____ in _____ classing me with the rankest modernists in America. I always did think he was a little crazy and now *I know it.' Yet this 'crazy'* minister is in perfectly good standing in the Southern Church.

"In the current (April) issue of the _____ one of the editors, Dr. _____, in an article about me says: 'We have ourselves received personal communications from him, and they were red hot with wrath against the truly evangelical basis of his own church and of the Protestant Church in general.' A more flagrant falsehood was never put on paper. He has had no such communications from me, nor has any one else on the face of the earth. Yet this man, who has as one of his associate editors, _____, would have no difficulty whatever in getting into any Presbytery in the Southern Church.

"I could give you scores of instances of this sort showing that men who are abysmally ignorant and fanatical and some of whom are shockingly untruthful, could answer satisfactorily any question put to them as a test of their fitness to enter the Southern Presbyterian ministry.

"I will be very glad to have you read this letter to your Commission because I think it reveals a situation in the Southern Church that is very serious.

"With every good wish.

"P. S. *Since you know the Commission better than I do, and what effect this letter would have, I will leave it to your judgment to use it or not.*"

This is not a pleasant letter to read. For Dr. Smith's sake I would gladly have withheld it, but to get the full significance of the postscript, it is necessary that the reader have before him the full text of the letter. The text of the letter explains the need of and gives

significance to the postscript. It is clear that after writing this letter, it occurred to Dr. Smith that it might be too strong meat even for the Commission: or to change my figure, Dr. Smith bethought himself that his letter contained a good deal of T.N.T., and that that high explosive, unless it is handled with the utmost care and skill, has at times an ugly way of injuring those who use it. The significance of the postscript lies in the fact that it puts it beyond doubt that Dr. Smith felt that he had in the chairman one upon whose good will and discretion he could rely to safeguard his (Dr. Smith's) interests. Dr. Smith's postscript is couched in the language of the confidential instructions of a principal to his thoroughly trusted agent.

3. Later we find the chairman of the Commission expressing himself as follows:

> "We may not agree with him (that is Dr. S.) when he says that even such fundamental doctrines as the trinity, the divinity of Christ and the atonement should be restated in the Confession, but if he believes that a restatement of these doctrines is needed, he has a perfect right to say so. If a man believes in these great doctrines, as Dr. Smith has affirmed that he does, there is certainly no heresy in advocating a change in the way they are stated in the Confession.
>
> "In the settlement of this problem two or three principles of Presbyterianism must not be overlooked.
>
> "First. Agreement in fundamental doctrines and liberty of opinion on non-essentials. When a minister declares that he is not in agreement with certain statements in the doctrinal standards of the church, he is not thereby judged a heretic and refused admittance to or cast out of our ministry. The Presbytery hears his statement of disagreement and the reasons for it, then decides whether, in its judgment, the point of divergence seriously affects an essential doctrine. This is historic and fundamental Presbyterianism, written into the constitution of the church, and we cannot long remain united as a church unless this principle is maintained.
>
> "Second. It is not heresy or disloyalty to advocate revision or restatement of doctrines in the Westminster Standards. The Holy Scriptures and not the standards are the infallible rule of faith and life in our church. We subscribe to the standards as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. If it can be shown that any statements in the Confession

or Catechisms are not substantiated by Scripture teaching, it is the duty of the church to revise them in order to be true to the Presbyterian heritage. This was the principle on which the Westminster Standards were formed and it will be a sad day in our church when this principle is forgotten."—*Arkansas Gazette*, May 10, 1930.)

The importance of this excerpt lies in two facts. It reveals the bias of the chairman of the Commission in favor of Dr. Smith. The chairman here appears as counsel for the defense (Dr. S.) He also appears as judge, expounding the law in favor of Dr. Smith. It is important also as showing the chairman's conception of Presbyterian law and procedure in a judicial inquest or inquiry. Of this last point it will be necessary to speak more fully later.

I pass over for the present the chairman's unguarded, unqualified and undocumented statement that Dr. Smith has affirmed that he believes in the doctrines of the trinity, the divinity of Christ, and the atonement. It will come up for consideration later.

In regard to the chairman's statement: "The Presbytery hears his (that is the dissentient's) statement of disagreement and the reasons for it, then decides whether, in its judgment, the point of divergence seriously affects an essential doctrine," it is sufficient to say that the action of a Presbytery in receiving a candidate applying for admission into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church is not at all parallel to that of a commission of judicial inquest. In the former case no issue has been raised as to the soundness in the faith of the applicant. If such an issue were raised, the Presbytery would at once be confronted with the duty, either of appointing a committee of judicial inquest, or of tabling formal charges against the candidate. In the latter case, such issue has been raised, and the very purpose for which the committee of judicial inquest has been appointed is to consider that specific issue and to decide whether or not there is a strong presumption that the candidate's views are not in accord with the teachings of our Standards.

The implications of what the chairman says in regard to "an essential doctrine" are all misleading. It is the more important to notice this because the Report of the Commission stresses this point, and further, there is not a little confusion in the mind of the church in

reference to it. The chairman's words imply that our Presbyteries distinguish between essential and non-essential doctrines of our system. That is clearly a mistake. Moreover, it is a mistake quite frequently made. It arises from the fact that the acceptance of the system of doctrine set forth in our Standards does not carry with it the acceptance of every proposition in the Standards. The reason that it does not is because there are propositions in the Standards that do not constitute a part of "the system of doctrine" that the candidate is expected to accept. But "the system of doctrine" itself he is expected to accept, and to accept in its entirety. This is the position of so competent an expositor of our form of government as the late Dr. Chas. Hodge. I may add that it is a less stringent construction than that adopted by leading expounders of ecclesiastical law in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. To me it seems on the whole to be the sane view. Dr. Hodge says: "We do not expect that our ministers should adopt every proposition contained in our standards. This they are not required to do. But they are required to adopt the system; and that system consists of certain doctrines, *no one of which can be omitted without destroying its iden*ity" (i. e. the identity of the system). [*Church Polity*, p. 338]. A system of doctrine by virtue of the fact that it is a system, is an organized whole, every part of which is related more or less directly to every other part. Remove any part and you have mutilated the system. It is to be feared that the chairman is not the only person whose mind is confused as to what are called "essential doctrines." "The substance or essence of a system of doctrine," says Dr. Chas. Hodge, "is just the system itself." [*Ibid*, p. 320.] The same confusion extends to Christianity itself. Dr. Warfield has well said that "the essence of Christianity is just Christianity." Again, the chairman says: "If a man believes in these great doctrines . . . there is certainly no heresy in advocating a change in the way they are stated in the Confession." The chairman misconceives and misstates the real issue. His word "advocating" is ambiguous. Our constitution abridges no man's liberty of thought: it cannot do so. Nor does it undertake to limit his liberty of speech, except, that if he remains in the Presbyterian Church, it requires him in the interests of the peace and purity of the church to seek changes of the

Constitution in a constitutional way. I regretfully affirm, but I affirm without fear of successful contradiction, that Dr. Smith has violated his ordination vow, in that, though he has been, rightly or wrongly, in reality or technically, a member in good standing in Arkansas Presbytery for twenty years or more, during all that time he has never sought in a constitutional way to secure the changes in our system of doctrine that would, in his judgment, bring the three doctrines mentioned above into a form that he believes would be more in accord with the Scriptures. Indeed, Dr. Smith seems to be much less concerned about bringing them into accord with the Scriptures, than with what he is pleased to call "the best Christian thought of our day." In regard to what is the best Christian thought of our day, it is likely that there would be wide differences of opinion.

The real issue is not: Has Dr. Smith a right to move in a constitutional way an amendment to any or all the doctrines of the Confession of Faith? The real issue raised by Dr. Smith's conduct is this: Has a Presbyterian minister a right to use a Presbyterian pulpit or the public press to discredit and bring into disrepute the system of doctrine set forth in our Standards or any of the doctrines of that system?

It may be well for us to hear Dr. Smith himself on this point. In his sermon of June 9, 1929, published in the *Arkansas Gazette* of June 10, 1929, Dr. Smith says: "To use a Presbyterian pulpit to undermine Presbyterian faith would be dishonorable." Is the chairman of the Commission prepared to deny this? Again, speaking of the doctrines of unconditional election and original sin, Dr. Smith says: "Such views as these are essential to distinctive Calvinism, and they are taught in our standards." [*Comments on the Letters, etc.*, p. 9.] Is the chairman prepared to deny this? And yet Dr. Smith rejects both of these doctrines.

It would look, then, as if Dr. Smith himself recognized that there are limitations to a Presbyterian minister's right to express himself about Presbyterian doctrines, at least in a Presbyterian pulpit. Does the chairman of the Commission suppose that speaking as Dr. Smith has spoken of those doctrines in the public press is less dishon-

orable than Dr. Smith affirms that it would be so to speak of them in a Presbyterian pulpit? Why did Dr. Smith resort to the public press? Was it not that he might reach a larger number of persons, Presbyterians included, than he could reach from his pulpit?

Unfortunately for Dr. Smith, therefore, he is condemned both by his silence and by his speech.

There is another feature of the chairman's defense of Dr. Smith that calls for attention. It is his use of the word "restatement." It is the more important to pause upon this, because there are not lacking evidences that others share the chairman's confusion of thought on this subject. What the chairman speaks of as the "restatement" of a doctrine, usually turns out to be a rejection of it and the substitution of another and different doctrine in its place. You may state the doctrine of the Trinity as it is stated in the Shorter Catechism; and then you may elaborate it more fully as in the Larger Catechism and the Confession of Faith: but these enlargements are not in any proper sense restatements of the doctrine. They are simply fuller statements. Nothing is more certain than that in the form in which they are stated in our standards, Dr. Smith is dissatisfied with all three of the doctrines mentioned by the chairman.

Thus it appears that the chairman's defense of Dr. Smith is stripped of cogency by its lack of insight, of information, and of discriminaton. While this is true, what needs to be noted is that in the paragraphs cited, *the chairman is defending Dr. Smith.* It would be hard for him to show a bias in Dr. Smith's favor in a more patent way.

I cannot dismiss the chairman's defense of Dr. Smith without yet another comment. Whatever may be true as to the chairman's personal acceptance of particular doctrinal views held by Dr. Smith, his statement just quoted seems quite clearly to show that he is in sympathy with the most fundamental of all of Dr. Smith's unsound doctrinal views, namely, with the view of so-called "Christian liberty" entertained by Dr. Smith along with the Auburn Affirmationists. What this is is manifest from the following statement of Dr. Smith:

WILLIAM SMITH MORTON LIBRARY
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
& PRESBYTERIAN SCHOOL OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VA 23227-4597

"Dr. McPheeters and I not only differ as to the truth or untruth of certain doctrines; we differ fundamentally in attitude; and while it is of importance to determine which of us is nearer the truth in his views (that is as to particular doctrines), an equally important question is involved: Is the Southern Presbyterian Church to be an organization dominated by one type of thought, or is it not? Is it to be an exclusive sect, committed to the preservation and propagation of 17th century theology? Or is it to be an inclusive Church committed to the discovery and propagation of truth and the spirit of its divine Founder? That is the question for its courts to answer." [*Columbia State*, October 27, 1929.]

Here Dr. Smith puts his finger upon one of the most fundamental issues with which our church is confronted today. It is true that he clouds the issue in stating it, but nonetheless the issue is there. It is this: Is the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. to be *an inclusive* church? What is an inclusive church? It is a church that allows divergent doctrinal views among its ministers. Such a church cannot honestly be a creedal church. Every one of its ministers may have a creed, and there may be as many creeds as there are ministers: but that means that the church as a whole will have no creed. A creed represents an honest effort on the part of a body of believers to "attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." That, the apostle declares [Eph. 4:13], to be the goal of the church in its present state. That, it should be observed, is the kind of unity for which Christ prayed. It is not a kind of unity, it may be, that will give the church power in the political arena, but it is the only kind of unity that will secure the effect which Christ sought to accomplish through the unity of His people, namely, that the "world may believe that thou didst send me" [John 17:2]. The world here spoken of by Christ consists of unregenerate men, but unregenerate men are not by any means all of them fools, nor are they lacking in penetrating intelligence, ethical discernment and high ethical ideals. No external unity will hide from their eyes the internal and really fundamental divisions that characterize an inclusive church, or the essential ethical falsity of such merely external unity.

It needs further to be said that in spite of "the plausible and pious talk" of Auburn Affirmationists and those who agree with them, the

Holy Ghost is not the author of doctrinal confusion any more than He is the author of confusion of any other kind. And to assume or assert that He is the author of doctrinal confusion comes perilously near being blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. All the presumptions are that doctrinal differences between Christians are due either to creaturely limitations, sinful infirmities, or to the father of lies, rather than to the Spirit of Truth. And certain it is that no effective testimony to the truth can be borne by those who are not themselves agreed as to what the truth is. In a word, there is no greater treason against truth than that of which an inclusive church, by virtue of the fact that it is inclusive, is guilty.

Thus, the correspondence between the chairman of the Commission and Dr. Smith reveals the facts that the so-called investigation of the reports concerning Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness was vitiated by the following "disreputatble and injurious" irregularities, namely: By showing that the precautions necessary to safeguard those conducting the investigation from improper and biasing influences were utterly disregarded, (1) in that Dr. Smith subjected the chairman to influences, the natural effect of which was to create in the breast of the latter a bias favorable to the former; (2) that both Dr. Smith and the chairman subjected the members of the Commission to influences, the natural effect of which was to distract their attention from the only issue really before them, undermine their loyalty to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., and create in their breasts a bias favorable to Dr. Smith; and finally, (3) that during the course of the correspondence, the chairman made his personal bias in favor of Dr. Smith so plain to the latter that Dr. Smith could address him as a principal addresses his confidential and trusted agent.

Section III. Facts Revealed by the Minutes of the Commission.

i. THE TITLE OF THE MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION READS:

> "Minutes of the meeting of the commission of Arkansas Presbytery appointed to investigate the rumors concerning the soundness in faith of Dr. Hay Watson Smith."

From this, it is clear that the matter specifically referred to the

Commission was an investigation of certain rumors imputing doctrinal unsoundness to Dr. Smith. For reasons that will appear later this fact needs to be noticed.

ii. THE FIRST PARAGRAPH IN THE MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION READS:

> "After three or four months of individual study of Dr. Smith's writings, the articles of those calling his orthodoxy in question, the doctrines of the Church involved, and Presbyterian law and procedure in such cases, the commission came together in Little Rock for a two-day session, March 24-25, 1930." [*Min.* p. 25].

From this statement it is clear:

1. That the Commission had in its hands in printed form the articles of those who had made themselves responsible for these reports. Those articles must have included the following, namely:

A pamphlet from the pen of Rev. F. Z. Browne, appearing November 15, 1928, entitled *An Answer to Statements Made In Open Letters and Published Articles by Hay Watson Smith*:

The overture of Augusta Presbytery to the General Assembly of 1929 in regard to Dr. Smith's unsound doctrinal views of Scripture.

A pamphlet from the pen of Dr. J. P. Robertson entitled *Open Letter to Dr. Hay Watson Smith,* dated August 16, 1929.

A communication in *The Columbia State,* September 22, 1929, by W. M. McPheeters:

A pamphlet by W. M. McPheeters entitled *A Reply To a Communication of Rev. Dr. Hay Watson Smith.*

It also had in its hands a complete set of the writings of Dr. Hay Watson Smith. These would include the following:

Evolution and Presbyterianism,

The Charge, the Facts and the Resolutions,

Comments on the Letters of Dr. W. M. McPheeters and Dr. J. P. Robertson,

Some Facts About Evolution,

A copy of paper read by Dr. Smith before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912.

Dr. Smith's sermon of June 9, 1929.

2. It is also clear that the Commission rightly regarded the writings of Dr. Smith as coming within the purview of the investigation it was appointed to conduct:

(1) Because, as the Commission says: "These writings constitute the basis of the rumors," it was appointed to investigate;

(2) Because, these writings being Dr. Smith's own statement of his doctrinal views would constitute what the law calls "primary evidence"—that is to say, evidence of a kind that cannot be disputed or set aside. It would only remain, therefore, for the Commission to assure itself that Dr. Smith's statements in these writings, had not been misinterpreted. Against that possibility, Par. 183, BCO, provides a safeguard. It will be found to be a matter of the first importance to bear these facts in mind.

iii. THE THIRD PARAGRAPH IN THE MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION, SO FAR AS WE ARE AT PRESENT CONCERNED WITH IT, READS:

"The following principles of procedure were agreed upon: First: *As to the nature of our work* (italics original) . . . Par. 183, *Book of Church Order*."

This makes it plain that the Commission itself recognized that it was appointed under, and that the nature of its task was defined by Par. 183, BCO. The part of that paragraph with which we are here concerned reads:

> "It is the duty of all church Sessions and Presbyteries to exercise care over those subject to their authority; and they shall, with due diligence and great discretion, demand from such persons satisfactory explanations concerning reports affecting their Christian character. . . . If such investigation, however, originating, should result in raising a strong presumption of the guilt of the party involved, the court shall institute process, and shall appoint a prosecutor to prepare the indictment and to conduct the case."

This paragraph gives all the information contained in our Standards in regard to "Presbyterian law and procedure" in the case of a judicial inquest or investigation, such as the Commission was appointed to conduct. It is important to notice this fact because the records will show that the Commission was not conrolled by "Presbyterian law and procedure" as set forth in Par. 183, BCO.

iv. PAR. 183, BCO.

An examination of this provision shows:

1. That the rumors or reports to be investigated affected Dr. Smith's Christian character, and, hence, if true, constituted "an offense, the proper object of judicial process." [BCO, par. 173.]

In this connection a statement of the chairman of the Commission calls for attention. In his defense of the action of the Commission *Arkansas Gazette,* May 10, 1930, he says:

> "We were instructed to investigate the rumors as to Dr. Smith's 'soundness in the faith.' His Christian character and practices as a minister were not in question."

Here the chairman says explicitly that Dr. Smith's Christian character was not in question. The law, on the other hand, says quite explicitly that the reports affected the Christian character of Dr. Smith. Indeed, that is the ground upon which they are made the matter of investigation. This statement, therefore, shows clearly how little attention the Commission paid to the law under which it was supposed to act, and how little real insight it had into the gravity of the matter with which it was dealing. The reports that they were to investigate, if true, did affect the Christian character of Dr. Smith; and on the other hand, those reports, unless they were justified by probable evidence, affected the Christian character of those who made themselves responsible for them. The Commission overlooked the fact that it could not affirm that there *was no prima facie* evidence that Dr. Smith's views are out of accord with the teachings of our standards, without at the same time affirming that there *was prima facie* evidence that those who made themselves responsible for the reports were guilty of slander. It cannot be too soon or too clearly understood that unless they can show that there is *prima facie* evidence for such reports, persons who originate or who make themselves responsible for rumors affecting the Christian character of church officers immediately become responsible to the courts having jurisdiction over them for the sin of slander. Par. 183 says expressly: "It is the duty of all church Sessions and Presbyteries to exercise care over those subject to their authority;" and Par. 76 makes it the duty of such courts to "take effectual care

that" persons subject to their jurisdiction "observe the constitution of the church." The constitution of the church makes slander an offense, just as clearly as it makes unsound doctrine an offense. To originate or circulate defamatory reports is as truly a violation of one's ordination vows as holding and promulgating unsound doctrinal views. No church can afford to permit the character of its officers to be recklessly aspersed. Had the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery borne these facts in mind, it would not have defamed those who made themselves responsible for the reports in regard to Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness, as in effect it did when it said that on investigation, the rumors referred to it "were found to be without sufficient ground for further action on the part of Arkansas Presbytery." [*Min.*, p. 31, par. 4.]

2. Par. 183 also shows that in and of themselves these rumors or reports constitute *prima facie* evidence, that is, evidence which, if unexplained or uncontradicted, would establish the fact alleged—that is, in this case the fact of Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness. If such were not the case, there would be no reason for investigating and demanding "satisfactory explanations" of such report or rumors.

3. DISTINCTION BETWEEN A JUDICIAL INQUEST AND A JUDICIAL PROCESS.

While it does not state the points of difference between them, still Par. 183 clearly distinguishes between a judicial inquest and a judicial process. It becomes important, therefore, to get before us the points of distinction between the two. They differ, then, the one from the other:

(1) In their respective *purposes.* The purpose of a judicial inquest is to ascertain whether or not there are grounds for *at least a reasonable doubt,* in this case, as to the doctrinal soundness of a church officer; the purpose of a judical process, on the other hand, is to show *beyond a reasonable doubt* that the views of a person whose doctrinal soundness has been impugned, either are or are not in accord with the teachings of our standards.

(2) They differ in the *kind of evidence* upon which their respective findings are based. A judicial inquest is concerned simply

and solely with what is known as *prima facie evidence* of an offense, that is, evidence which, if unexplained, is sufficient to establish the fact of an offense; a judicial process, on the other hand, is concerned exclusively with what is known as *conclusive evidence*, that is, evidence that cannot be explained away, evidence that establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that a person is guilty of the offense with which he is charged.

(3) They differ the one from the other in *the method* by which they arrive at their respective findings. In a judicial inquest the person concerned is confronted with an informal charge, or charges, and the evidence adduced to sustain it, and is required to show beyond a reasonable doubt that it does not constitute *prima facie* evidence that he is guilty of the offense charged, that is to show that the evidence adduced can be satisfactorily explained on some other supposition than that of his guilt; in a judicial process, on the other hand, those who prefer the charge are required to show that the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the person concerned is guilty of the offense charged, that is, to show that the evidence adduced cannot be explained upon any other assumption than that of the truth of the offense charged. This involves the eliciting, sifting, and weighing of the evidence pro and con; the exposition of the law bearing on the case; the rendering of a judgment of acquittal or conviction by the court trying the case; and, in the case of conviction, the determination by the court of the kind of discipline suited to the offense.

(4) They differ in their respective *findings* themselves. Those conducting a judical inquest are strictly limited to finding either that there is or is not "a strong presumption" that the views of the person concerned are out of accord with our Standards: for them to express a judgment that the views of the person concerned either are or are not in accordance with our Standards; or to express a judgment that the views of the person concerned do or do not expose him to discipline of such and such a kind is to exceed their authority and usurp the functions of those charged with a judicial process; on the other hand, those conducting a judicial process must affirm that the views of the person concerned either

are or are not in accordance with the teachings of our Standards; and, in the latter case, that the offense of which the person concerned is guilty calls for discipline of such and such a kind, varying from mere admonition to deposition.

One who wishes to form an impartial judgment in regard to the action of the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery in the case of Dr. Smith must bear these distinctions in mind.

4. PAR. 183 DEFINES THE PROCEDURE, OR METHOD, TO BE FOLLOWED IN A JUDICIAL INQUEST.

As already indicated, the procedure in a judicial inquest involves three steps. Of these, the first is not specifically mentioned because necessarily implied in the second. These steps are:

(1) The formulation of the rumors and of the statements supposed to furnish *prima facie evidence* that AB has been guilty of an offense.

(2) The laying of these rumors and statements before AB and demanding of him "satisfactory explanations" of the same. It should be observed here that to demand explanations of AB is a very different thing from making explanations for AB. The offering of explanations is an act of counsel for the defense, and accordingly, is not permissible to those who are conducting a judicial inquest.

Where AB's doctrinal soundness is the issue, to be "satisfactory," the explanation would have to make it plain beyond a reasonable doubt that AB's statements in regard to any doctrine, when properly understood, do not constitute *prima facie* that his views in regard to the doctrine in question are out of accord with our Standards. Should AB's explanations fail to do this, that fact of iself would constitute a "strong presumption" that he was guilty of the offense charged—namely, of not conforming his ministry to his ordination obligation. Caesar's wife must be above suspicion.

(3) A judgment by the Commission to the effect that AB's "explanations" did or did not explain away the *prima facie* evidence of his doctrinal unsoundness. Of course, this judgment would have to be based on and be justified by a comparison of AB's doctrinal views with the teachings of our Standards. Nor would it be enough to

show that in some features of a doctrine AB's views are in accord with our Standards, if on other features of the same doctrine or upon some other doctrine, they were not in accord with our Standards.

5. PAR. 183 DEFINES THE SPIRIT IN WHICH A JUDICIAL INQUEST IS TO BE CONDUCTED.

It says that with "due diligence" and "great discretion" the Commission are to "demand" of AB explanations of the reports. The word "demand" and the two phrases, "due diligence" and "great discretion" indicate clearly the spirit in which the Commission was to discharge its duties. The word "demand" indicates that the Commission was to face its task with a proper sense of its responsibilities and also of its authority, and to prosecute it without fear or favor. By "due diligence" is evidently meant that the investigators were to address themselves to their task with patience and the most painstaking care. And by "great discretion" is meant that, in view of the variety and importance of the interests involved, the investigators were to perform their task with good judgment, in a judicial temper, and with scrupulous regard for *all* the interests concerned. These interests include not only the reputation of the person charged with the offense, but also that of the person or persons who had made themselves responsible for the reports, and ultimately the good name of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and the good name of the Commission itself, all of which are directly or indirectly involved in the investigation.

In the case before us, the Commission could not show bias or partiality without doing injustice either to Dr. Smith, or to those who had made themselves responsible for the rumors regarding his doctrinal unsoundness. It could not ignore any part of the evidence bearing upon the case without perpetrating a wrong upon the interests of truth and upon the good name and honor of the Presbyterian Church. Nor could it do either of these things without bringing dishonor upon itself. The records show that the Commission did all these things.

iii, v. FACTS REVEALED BY PAR. 2 [MIN. p. 29].

After stating "The Principles of Procedure Agreed Upon" [*Min.*, p. 25], and giving the text of a "Resolution as to Form of Procedure" that was offered and lost [*Min.*, pp. 26-28], the Commission states the form of procedure actually followed [*Min.*, p. 29].

I. Paragraph 2 reads:

> "The Commission then resolved to proceed with the investigation upon the basis of Dr. Smith's written statements, especially his statement before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 and that they be tested according to the doctrinal standards of the Church."

This paragraph, then, discloses the rather startling fact that the Commission *decided not to deal specifically with the rumors* that had been referred to it concerning Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness, though the specific task that it had been appointed to perform was just that of investigating these rumors. Though it had had four months in which to do so, the Commission did not formulate these rumors or the evidence, where such was given, alleged to support them. Of course, under these circumstances, it could not confront Dr. Smith with them and demand from him satisfactory explanations of them. That is to say, the Commission deliberately turned its back both upon the specific task that had been specifically assigned it, and upon the method of performing said task prescribed in Par. 183, BCO. Indeed, in the seven printed pages covered by them [*Min.*, pp. 25-31] neither the word "rumor" nor its synonym "report" occurs in the proceedings of the Commission until we come to its recommendation in the next to the last paragraph of its Minutes.

It will only be fair here to call attention to the Commission's explanation and attempted justification of its course. Its excuse for paying no specific attention to the rumors referred to it seems to have been that "the writings of Dr. Smith represent his views and form the basis of the rumors" [*Min.*, p. 21, par. 6]. Unquestionably this statement is true; but obviously it does not furnish the slightest justification for ignoring the (informal) charges embodied in the rumors for which the Rev. F. Z. Browne, Augusta Presbytery, Dr. J. P. Robertson, and myself had made ourselves respectively personally responsible. None of those mentioned

had asked the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery to formulate his charges for him. Not to mention other and more fundamental disqualifications, the manifest bias of the Commission in favor of Dr. Smith rendered it incompetent to formulate informal charges against him. And to say that its investigation had shown that "they (the rumors) were found to be without sufficient ground for further action on the part of Arkansas Presbytery" when its Minutes show that it had ignored these rumors was—well, to say the very least, not to the credit of the Commission.

At this point, it will be proper for me to call attention to the reports that the Commission was appointed to investigate, but did not. I shall take these up in the order in which they appeared in public print. First, then, in a pamphlet from the pen of the Rev. F. Z. Browne, appearing November 15, 1928, and entitled *An Answer to Statements Made In Open Letters and Published Articles by Hay Watson Smith,* Mr. Browne alleges (1) that Dr. Smith denies "the plenary or verbal inspiration" of the Scriptures and "scoffs at the very mention of a personal satan" [p. 6]; (2) that Dr. Smith denies "the revelation and fact of man's fall in sin with the natural degeneration inherent in both man and nature as the result" [p. 7]; that Dr. Smith denies "the virgin birth" [p. 17]; (4) "the bodily resurrection of Christ" [p. 14]; (5) "the atonement of Christ thru His shed blood" [p. 14]; (6) "the regeneration of the believer" [p. 14]; (7) "the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost" [p. 14]; (8) "The second coming of Christ" [p. 15]; (10) "the doctrine of heaven and hell" [p. 15].

Rev. Dr. J. P. Robertson in an *Open Letter to Dr. Hay Watson Smith,* dated August 16, 1929, alleges (1) that Dr. Smith denies that "anything supernatural ever happened" [p. 5]; (2) that, like every evolutionist, Dr. Smith shows a bent toward Pantheism when he (Dr. Smith) says: "Evolution implies throughout the realm of nature from atoms to suns, amoeba to man, the presence of immanent creative power" [p. 7]; (3) that Dr. Smith holds that the "Bible contains many historical and scientific errors" [p. 6]; (4) that rumor charges Dr. Smith with denying "the real deity of Christ" [p. 5]; (5) "the fall of man" [p. 5]; (6) the sacrifice of Christ

"as a proper real and full satisfaction to His Father's justice on our behalf" [p. 5]; (7) "the virgin birth, etc." [p. 6].

The Presbytery of Augusta in an Overture to the General Assembly of 1929 alleges that Dr. Smith "assails the truthfulness of the Bible."

The writer in an article appearing in the *Columbia State,* September 22, 1929, says that "rumors allege that Dr. Smith denies (1) 'the infallible truth and divine authority of the scriptures;' (2) 'their trustworthiness as a record of the origin and development of the religion of Israel;' (3) 'their trustworthiness, in part at least, as a guide in ethics;' (4) 'the doctrine of unconditional election;' (5) 'the doctrine of a bodily resurrection,' not to mention others."

It will be observed, then, that these reports specified twenty or more particulars in which Dr. Smith is out of accord with the teachings of our standards. They were in print and were in the hands of the Commission. And yet, one reading its Minutes would never know that the specific and specified purpose for which the Commission was appointed was to investigate these rumors, to demand of Dr. Smith satisfactory explanations of them, and then, in the light of Dr. Smith's teachings and the teachings of our Standards, to determine whether or not there was a strong presumption that Dr. Smith was guilty of the doctrinal unsoundness imputed to him in the reports.

The chairman's explanation of the fact that the Commission ignored the method plainly prescribed in Par. 183, BCO, and described above, is "The method of making this investigation was left to us." [*Arkansas Gazette,* May 10, 1930]. This only shows how little the chairman had learned about Presbyterian procedure in the case of a judicial inquest from his four months study of the subject.

2. PARAGRAPHS 3, 4, 7, 8.

So far as we are here concerned with them read:

"Questions discussed:

"Par. 3—Deity of Christ; Par. 4—Scriptures; Par. 7—Reprobation; Par. 8—Total Depravity."

Before commenting upon the facts revealed by these paragraphs, it is worth noting that if combined, those of Dr. Smith's writings in the hands of the Commission, would make a volume of two hundred pages more or less. As I shall show at the proper time, an examination of his writings will reveal the fact that Dr. Smith has expressed himself with unequivocal clearness (1) upon a number of specific doctrines not mentioned by the Commission; (2) upon the Calvanistic element in the system of doctrine as a whole; (3) upon the system of doctrine contained in our Standards as a whole; (4) and finally that Dr. Smith has expressed himself upon essential features of the principles of church government embodied in our Standards. No one who will read Dr. Smith's writings can fail to see that they give a view of Dr. Smith's attitude toward the system of doctrine and the principles of government set forth in our Standards that is at once comprehensive and specific.

And yet, despite this mass of not only *prima facie,* but of overwhelmingly conclusive evidence of Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness, its Minutes reveal the fact that the Commission after its four months of study of Dr. Smith's writings, found only five instances in which Dr. Smith's doctrinal views seemed to it to call for attention. These have been indicated above.

But, bad as all this is, had the Commission showed the slightest —to use a phrase of its own—"fidelity to the truth" in dealing with Dr. Smith's views on these doctrines and tested them, as it professed to do, by the Standards of the Church, the outcome of its Report would necessarily have been different. But, as it will be my painful duty later to show, it did not state Dr. Smith's views on any of these matters fully and fairly, nor did it test his views on any of them by a comparison with the teachings of our Standards.

Thus, the records reveal the fact that the Commission did not perform the task that it was specifically appointed to perform. On the contrary, instead of formulating the informal charges contained in the reports that had been referred to it, together with the evidence, where any was alleged, in support of said charges, and presenting these charges and this evidence to Dr. Smith and demanding of him satisfactory explanations of the same, the Commission from

the mass of Dr. Smith's unsound doctrinal views picked out five of its own selection. It did not confront Dr. Smith with what was said about these five in his writings and demand from him explanations of his personal statements of his views on them. These views it professed to test by our Standards: but did not so test them. On the contrary, as at the proper time I shall show, it contented itself with giving a garbled statement of Dr. Smith's views on the doctrines mentioned, thus creating an impression in regard to them that was contrary to the facts. By a garbled statement of Dr. Smith's views, I mean a statement in which the Commission suppressed the most essential characteristics of those views, and by so doing, created a totally false impression as to their real character.

III, vi. FACTS REVEALED BY PAR. 4, 5, 6, 7, MIN. p. 25; PAR. 7, MIN. p. 21; PAR. 6, 9, MIN. p. 29; PAR. 2, MIN. p. 23.

(i) Paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, [Min. p. 21].

The first four of these paragraphs read:

> "First: *As to the nature of our work.* (Italics original) . . . We are . . . commissioned . . . to ascertain what they (Dr. Smith's doctrinal views) are and then to decide whether, in our opinion they are in accord with essential Presbyterianism. . . ."
>
> "Second: *As to the end and purpose of all discipline* (italics original) . . ."
>
> "Third: *As to the two great principles to be guarded*: (italics original) 1. That no essential truth of the gospel be denied. 2. That no man's liberty in Christ be infringed."
>
> "Fourth: Liberty of Opinion on matters not considered vital to the System of Doctrine recognized. . . . (c) We subscribe to confession and catechisms as containing the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scriptures. Agreement on every point not necessary. Adopting Act of 1729."
>
> "Fifth: *As to what constitutes an offense. . . .* "

1. The first matter in these paragraphs that claims attention is the phrases "essential Presbyterianism," "essential truth of the gospel," "liberty in Christ," "liberty of opinion on matters not considered vital to the system of doctrine." The first impression that an informed person is likely to receive is that these vague and vacuous phrases have been introduced for rhetorical effect. Reflection,

however, will convince any one that, meaningless as these phrases may be, they are nonetheless significant and revelatory. They make one aware of the magnificent haze with which the Commission invested the grave but comparatively simple task assigned it, a haze that so distorted the thinking of the Commission that without any clear consciousness of what it was doing, it confused the task assigned it with a totally different one with which it had no authority to deal. Certain of these high-sounding phrases clearly indicate that the Commission felt itself authorized and competent to select from the system of doctrine contained in our Standards such and so many as in its judgment were "vital to the system."

A candidate for ordination is not asked: "Do you accept essential Presbyterianism?" If he were, and was an intelligent man, he would be likely to ask: "What do you mean?" He is not asked: "Do you accept the essential truths of the gospel?" Here, again, if he were an intelligent man, he would be apt to say: "Are there any unessential truths of the gospel?" He is not asked: "Do you accept such and so many of the teachings of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms as in your judgment are vital to the system of doctrine?"

The questions that he is asked are these:

"(1) Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

"(2) Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of this church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?

"(3) Do you approve the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.?"

And he is expected to return an unqualified affirmative answer to each of these questions. Having done this, he is required to sign the following form: "I, AB, do sincerely receive and subscribe to the above obligation" (that is the obligation assumed in answering the above questions) "as a just and true exhibition of my faith and principles, and do resolve and promise to exercise my ministry in conformity thereto." Subscription to the system of doctrine con-

tained in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms is not a pick and choose matter. There are, no doubt, propositions in the Confession of Faith that are not included under this obligation, but there are no doctrines—certainly no doctrines of the Reformed system of faith—that are not comprehended in this ordination obligation.

Par. 7 [*Min.* p. 21] brings before us the fruit of this confusion of thought on the part of the Commission. It reads as follows:

"II. ESSENTIAL DOCTRINES.

"We concerned ourselves especially with Dr. Smith's views respecting the Deity of Christ, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Sinfulness of Man, the Atoning Work of Christ and Salvation by Faith. These doctrines we consider a fair and sufficient test of a minister's soundness in the Faith."

The serenity and the assurance with which the Commission makes this pronouncement are—interesting. Does any Presbytery in receiving a candidate or a minister coming from another denomination feel itself limited to these doctrines when it is seeking to ascertain his fitness for the ministry in the Presbyterian Church? One would suppose that the Commission was not aware that the Presbyterian Church U. S. is, by profession at least, Calvinistic. That is to say, that it considers the Calvinistic doctrines embodied in its Confession to be as truly essential doctrines of the gospel of Christ as any of the doctrines mentioned by the Commission. The Commission evidently takes its conception of Christian liberty—what it calls a "man's liberty in Christ"—from the Auburn Affirmationists. Certainly that conception finds no countenance anywhere in the Constitution of our church.

2. The Commission says: "We are—commissioned . . . to ascertain what they (Dr. Smith's doctrinal views) are and then to decide, whether in our opinion they are in accord with essential Presbyterianism." Examination will show that there are here as many misconceptions as there are propositions.

No doubt a knowledge of, and especially an insight into Dr. Smith's doctrinal views was necessary, if the Commission was to discharge the duty imposed upon it by Par. 183, BCO. The possession of such knowledge and insight would be needed in order to determine whether or not Dr. Smith's explanations of the *prima*

facie evidence upon which the reports were based, and which, of course, was furnished by his statements, were satisfactory. That is to say, unless the Commission had a just insight into the nature of the errors alleged to be evidenced by Dr. Smith's statements, it could not possibly say whether Dr. Smith's explanations explained away this *prima facie* evidence of error.

No doubt, then, the Commission needed a knowledge of Dr. Smith's views, and particularly an insight into the significance of his views, just as it needed a knowledge of the teachings of our Standards and insight into the significance of those teachings: just as it needed a knowledge of Presbyterian law and procedure. Unfortunately for the Commission, its Minutes and Report show that it was hampered at every point by lack of knowledge and insight into all of these matters. It ought, however, to be added, that the records show that the Commission had much more knowledge of Dr. Smith's doctrinal views than it was at all willing to avail itself of or to share with the public.

Nonetheless, it is a mistake when the Commission says that it was appointed "to ascertain" Dr. Smith's views. On the contrary, what it was appointed to do, and what it did not do, was to demand of Dr. Smith "satisfactory explanations" of the rumors abroad concerning his views.

And so, when the Commission says that it was appointed to "decide" whether in its opinion Dr. Smith's views are in accord with "essential Presbyterianism," it is again mistaken. It was not even appointed to *decide* whether Dr. Smith's views are in accord with the teachings of our Standards. It was appointed to deal with reports that in and of themselves were assumed to furnish *prima facie* evidence that Dr. Smith's views were not in accord with the Standards. What they were appointed to "*decide*," and the only thing that they were appointed to "*decide*" was whether Dr. Smith's explanations of the reports were satisfactory. They were not appointed to bring in a verdict, either convicting Dr. Smith or acquitting Dr. Smith of doctrinal unsoundness. Such a verdict legally given is based upon *conclusive* evidence: evidence that has been thoroughly sifted and weighed. The only judgments that the Commission was authorized

to pronounce were either that Dr. Smith's explanations had explained away the *prima facie* evidence of his doctrinal unsoundness furnished by his statements, or that they had not explained it away. That is to say, the only verdicts possible for the Commission to render were either a Scotch verdict to the effect that the informal charge alleging *prima facie* evidence of doctrinal unsoundness on Dr. Smith's part had not been proved; or that it had been proved. But a Scotch verdict is very far from a verdict of acquittal. And also a verdict alleging the existence of *prima facie* evidence of erroneous doctrinal views on Dr. Smith's part is very far from a verdict of conviction. The Commission, however, evidently felt itself competent to pass a verdict of acquittal in the premises. In other words, it proceeded upon the unexpressed assumption that it was appointed to conduct a "judicial process," that is a trial. This becomes the more evident as we notice the language used in the paragraphs that follow. Thus the Commission says: "As to the end and purpose of all discipline." This implies that it was dealing with a case of discipline. If it was not dealing with a case of discipline why should it concern itself with "the end and purpose of discipline?" The question of discipline arises and can only arise after one has been convicted of an offense. Again, it says: "As to what constitutes an offense." This clearly indicates it felt itself appointed to determine whether an offense had been committed. On the contrary, what it was appointed to determine was whether or not there was ground for *formally charging* Dr. Smith with the offense of doctrinal unsoundness. That question would turn upon whether or not Dr. Smith's explanations of his statements divested them of the character of *prima facie* evidence of his doctrinal unsoundness.

(ii) Paragraphs 6, 9 [Min., p. 29].

1. The first of these paragraphs reads:

> "Resolved, that in regard to the Scriptures, we find that Dr. Smith is somewhat liberal in the matter of interpretation and opinion, and goes in certain particulars beyond the orthodox views of the church, yet it is our judgment that the issue does not justify judicial process."

A careful reading of this statement reveals the fact that the Commission first says that there is *prima facie* evidence that Dr. Smith's

teaching in regard to Scripture are out of accord with our Standards, and then appends the judgment that the issue does not justify judicial process. The Book, however, expressly provides that unless Dr. Smith's explanations divest his statements of their character as *prima facie* evidence of the doctrinal unsoundness of his views, the Commission has no right to any judgment as to whether there is or is not to be a judicial process. The language of the Book is mandatory. It says that where investigation results in raising "a strong presumption of the guilt of the party involved," the court *shall* institute process."

Here, again, as before, the Commission practically transforms its investigation into a judicial process, in that it practically declares that, though not in accord with the teachings of our Standards, Dr. Smith's views do not call for any measure of discipline—from admonition, the lowest, to deposition, the highest. It is as if a person at the bar of a court should plead guilty, and the court should make that plea the basis of a judgment of acquittal.

2. Paragraph 9 reads:

> "Total depravity: After considerable discussion on this point, Dr. _____ stated that he could not remain longer with the Commission at this date and was given permission to cast his *vote against any censure* of Dr. Smith for his views on total depravity."

How could the Commission make it plainer that it was practically engaged in a judicial process, or that it recognized the fact that Dr. Smith's statements created so strong a presumption of guilt as to raise the question: Should not Dr. Smith be disciplined? The question of censure can only emerge after one has been pronounced guilty of some offense.

(iii) Paragraph 2 [Min., p. 23].

This paragraph reads:

> "We find that he (Dr. Smith) has not substantially changed his views since then (that is, since his reception by Arkansas Presbytery in 1912), and that, in our opinion, the points of his divergence from our Standards are not of sufficient character to disqualify him from remaining a minister in good standing in the Southern Presbyterian Church."

Here, again, we have the Commission first affirming the sufficiency of the *prima facie* evidence, that is, admittng that Dr. Smith's doctrinal views in regard to the Deity of Christ, etc., are not in accord with our Standards, and then following it up by volunteering a verdict that these divergences did not warrant deposition. Even if there had been any ground for such a verdict, the Commission was not the body to render the verdict. Further, the Commission overlooks the fact that an offense may call for some other and lesser penalty than deposition.

Looking back over these last three paragraphs, one cannot avoid the impression that the conscience of the Commission gagged painfully at the conclusion to which the Commission's sympathy for Dr. Smith, together with its lack of moral courage, were forcing it.

The record here reveals the fact that the Commission under pretext of an investigation usurped the functions of a judicial process and that, in conducting that process, it played by turns the varied and diverse roles of prosecutor, counsel for the defense, witness and court.

Here, again, the record reveals irregularities that transformed the so-called investigation of the rumors concerning Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness into a travesty.

Section IV. Facts Revealed by the Report of Commission.

A. Facts Revealed by Report of Commission as to the Relation Between the Action of the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery in 1930 and the Action of Arkansas Presbytery in Receiving Dr. Smith Into its Membership at its Meeting at Cotton Plant, Ark., in April, 1912.

i. FACTS REVEALED BY PARAGRAPHS 6 [MIN., P. 21]; PAR. 6; [IBID, P. 22]; PAR. 2, [IBID, P. 23].

These paragraphs read:

"The investigation has been made upon the basis of Dr. Smith's sermons, pamphlets, and written statements, *especial attention being given to his statement before the Presbytery at the time of his reception in* 1912" [*Min.*, p. 21].

"In conclusion, we would respectfully call the attention of Presbytery to the fact that Dr. Smith made a clear and straightforward statement of his views and the points of his divergence from the Confession and Catechisms of the Church at the time of his reception into the Presbytery in 1912, *and that the Pres-*

bytery did not deem his points of divergence as affecting the essential and necessary doctrines of the Church.

"We find that he has not substantially changed his views since then, and that, in our opinion, the points of his divergence from our Standards are not of sufficient character to disqualify him from remaining a minister in good standing in the Southern Presbyterian Church" [*Min.*, pp. 22, 23].

These statements disclose the following facts:

1. That the action of Arkansas Presbytery, when at its regular Spring Meeting in 1912 it received the Rev. Hay Watson Smith into its membership and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., was in 1930 made by the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery the basis of its report touching its investigation of rumors concerning Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness, and, as the result of this use of it, said action of 1912 was revived and endorsed by said Commission and by Arkansas Presbytery, when said Presbytery received, spread upon its Minutes, and adopted the recommendation contained in the Report of its Commission, and that, by so doing, Arkansas Presbytery and its Commission, in 1930, made themselves partakers in whatever guilt attaches to the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 in receiving Dr. Smith and to its record of said action in its Minutes.

2. That, when in 1912 he applied for admission into Arkansas Presbytery and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., Dr. Smith "made a clear and straightforward statement of his views and the points of his *divergence* from the Confession and Catechisms of the church at the time of his reception into the Presbytery in 1912."

ii. **FACTS REVEALED BY OPENING PARAGRAPH OF LETTER FROM DR. SMITH TO CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION, DATED JANUARY 28, 1930.**

This paragraph reads:

"The other day I sent copies of the paper that I read before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 to all the members of your Commission. I feel that I would like to put into your hands the original of this paper and I am sending it under separate cover."

This shows that the statement made to Arkansas Presbytery by Dr. Smith in 1912 was a written statement and was read by Dr. Smith before Arkansas Presbytery.

Later, in the year 1930, Dr. Smith published this paper in full in a pamphlet entitled *Prestige and Perquisites.* It is from this pamphlet that I shall quote. I should like, if time and space permitted, to quote in full what Dr. Smith has to say in regard to each doctrine covered by his statement. Unfortunately, my space does not permit this. I must be content, therefore, to quote with sufficient fullness to do Dr. Smith no injustice, and to put the reader in possession of the particular or particulars in which Dr. Smith's views are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards.

iii. FACTS REVEALED BY PAPER WHICH DR. SMITH READ BEFORE ARKANSAS PRESBYTERY IN 1912.

(i) Facts Indicated as to Dr. Smith's Purpose in Reading His Paper.

Dr. Smith's purpose in notifying Arkansas Presbytery of his divergencies from the teachings of our Standards appears from two statements, one near the beginning and another near the close of his paper. These read:

> "I realize that you, as a Presbytery, must be loyal to Presbyterian Standards. You have been set for their defense. It becomes therefore, my duty to indicate to you my divergences from the doctrines of the Westminster Standards, and yours to say whether I shall be received into your body as a Presbyterian minister." (P. & P. p. 7.)

And again, in closing his paper he said:

> "In my own opinion, they (i. e., his divergences from the teachings of our Standards) touch nothing vital. I have submitted them to you because I cannot be sure what estimate you will put upon them, and because, if I should enter the ministry of the Southern Church, I must do so with absolute honesty." (P. & P. 15.)

These statements reveal the following facts:

1. That, when in 1912 he sought admission to Arkansas Presbytery, *Dr. Smith was himself aware that,* in regard to the doctrines mentioned in his paper, *his personal views were out of accord with the teachings of our Standards.*

2. That he *frankly informed Arkansas Presbytery* that his views on said doctrines *were out of accord* with the teachings of our Standards.

3. That Dr. Smith practically based his request for admission into the membership of Arkansas Presbytery and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. upon the understanding and condition that he would be allowed to hold and teach his personal views upon the doctrines that he mentioned. With Dr. Smith's own statement of his doctrinal views, so far as they are revealed in the paper read before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912, before us, we can judge whether or not they "touch anything vital."

(ii) Facts Revealed as to Dr. Smith's Doctrinal Views by the Paper Which He Read Before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912.

1. Facts Revealed in Regard to Dr. Smith's View of Scripture.

Dr. Smith's first *admitted divergence* from the teachings of our Standards relates to the doctrine of Scripture taught in them. His own view of Scripture Dr. Smith states thus:

> "I believe the Bible to be the inspired revelation of God's will and character to men. . . . But this view of the Scripture is entirely consistent, in my judgment, with the acceptance of the modern view of the origin, date, and authorship of the various books of the Bible, and with a rejection of that theory of inspiration which makes the Scriptures infallible in all matters of science, history, ethnology, etc.
>
> "As to the literary history and structure of the Bible, I have been carefully over both sides of this long drawn out controversy, and I accept the conclusions of the more conservative scholars—such as those set forth, for example, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.*' (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 7.)
>
> "Not only has the acceptance of these views of the Bible, its composition and inspiration, in no degree weakened my faith in it as the essential word of God to man, it has distinctly deepened and vitalized it." (P. & P. p. 8.)

What is involved in the above statement appears from the fact that the late Dr. S. R. Driver, an outstanding representative of the views of the more conservative scholars referred to by Dr. Smith, speaking of the matter contained in Gen. i—xi, says:

> "These chapters contain no account of the real beginnings, either of the earth itself, or of man and human civilization upon it." (*Com. on Gen. Westminster Series*, p. xlii.)

Again, speaking of the patriarchal narratives in Gen. xii—l, he says:

> "We may, perhaps, succeed in finding a historic core in the patriarchal narratives." (Op. cit. p. xlv.)

The foregoing statement reveals the following facts:

(1) That Dr. Smith holds that the narratives in Gen. i—xi furnish no trustworthy information (a) as to the origin of the universe, of the earth, of man, of sin, or any of the other matters mentioned in these chapters; (b) as to God's relations to the universe and to man, not to mention other matters.

(2) That Dr. Smith holds that Gen. xii—l gives no trustworthy information (a) as to the existence of any such persons as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, or of God's dealings with them; (b) as to God's covenant with Abraham and its unfolding during subsequent history.

I need not trace the ramifications of Dr. Smith's doctrine of Scripture further, nor need I quote either Scripture or our Standards to show that Dr. Smith's doctrine of Scripture is not only antithetic to, but subversive of the teachings both of Scripture and of our Standards. It annihilates the teachings of the Confession of Faith, Ch. IV "Of Creation;" Ch. V "Of Providence;" Ch. VI "Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment Thereof;" Ch. VII "Of God's Covenant with Man." And, needless to say, in doing this, it thoroughly wrecks the foundation upon which historic Christianity is built—historic Christianity everywhere assuming the trustworthiness of the entire Old Testament. And not to dwell too long here, Dr. Smith's doctrine of Scripture will, as the late Dr. Willis J. Beecher has truly said, be found to force those who hold it to the conclusion "that Jesus and Paul were either mentally or morally so incompetent that they acquiesced in false opinions concerning the Scripture and used these false opinions for the foundation of the gospel they preached."

So much, then, for Dr. Smith's doctrine of Scripture.

2. FACTS REVEALED IN REGARD TO DR. SMITH'S VIEW OF CREATION.

Dr. Smith's next *admitted divergence* from the teaching of our Standards, relates to the doctrine of Creation. One of their briefer statements of this doctrine reads:

> "The work of creation is that wherein God did, in the beginning, by the word of His power, make of nothing, the world and all things therein for Himself, within the space of six days, and all very good." (L. C. Ques. 15.)

The phrase "six days" the Standards simply take over from the Scriptures without interpreting it. They define the meaning of the term "create" by adding "or make of nothing" [C. F. IV, 1]. The essence of the idea, therefore, is the bringing into existence by the divine power of something that prior to the exercise of that power had no existence.

Dr. Smith, on the other hand, says:

THE METHOD OF CREATION

> "I believe the account in Genesis of the origin of the world and of life to be true in substance. That is to say, I believe that God created the world and all life; that He created man in His own image, breathing into him the breath of life. But it seems to me certain that this work of creation was a more or less gradual process, extending over countless years, rather than a specific act, or a succession of sharply separated specific acts. To say that I accept the theory, or hypothesis, if one prefers, of evolution would imply, or *ought* to imply, that I have made myself master of the subject—something that I most assuredly have not done. But I have read enough on the subject to become convinced that the evolutionary theory is the only one that explains and reduces to order a great mass of phenomena opening before us in the natural world. I accept the theory, therefore, to the extent that it validates itself in fact, and proves itself a good working hypothesis. It thus becomes to me simply God's method of bringing the world and its life into existence. The theory of evolution can no more work without a divine creative and sustaining energy behind it, than a lifeless seed can develop or an architect's plan build a house. . . ." (P. & P. p. 8, 9.)

My space does not permit me to enter into any detailed analysis or discussion of Dr. Smith's statement. It will be enough to say that it reveals the following facts:

(1) That when Dr. Smith speaks of evolution as though it meant or could mean a method of creation, it indicates that he is laboring under some confusion of thought. Evolution may be a method of production, but it cannot be a "method of creation." "Evolution" and "creation" are antithetic terms—creation meaning bringing into existence something that had no existence, and evolution meaning the unfolding of what is in something already existing. It is evident, therefore, that the ideas are contradictory opposites one of the other.

(2) That when Dr. Smith says "I believe the account in Genesis of the origin of the world and of life to be true in substance," his statement is too vague to have any real meaning. The content of the phrase "in substance" is known only to Dr. Smith himself. Hence, it conveys no information to the reader.

(3) It is evident that Dr. Smith uses "evolution" as a term of scientific definition, but, as science is at present conceived (and, in my judgment, wrongly conceived), it deals and can only deal with "second causes." I hope that the time will come when it will be generally recognized that the scientific method can be applied to investigations concerning the First Cause; but such is certainly not the case at present. Science, as at present conceived, is concerned solely with the action and interaction of "second causes." That means, of course, that the term "God" is not in the vocabulary of science. This is clear from the following statement of Prof. J. Arthur Thompson, who is certainly competent to speak as a representative of science. He says:

> "When Laplace, answering Napoleon's question about God, said that he 'had no need of that hypothesis,' he obviously meant that that august concept was foreign to the astronomical 'universe of discourse.'" *i. e., foreign to the only ideas of which astronomy as a science takes or can take cognizance.* (*Int. to Science*, p. 213.)

(4) That Dr. Smith's so-called doctrine of Creation teaches a doctrine of God's relation to the universe that is the contradictory opposite of that taught in our Standards. Dr. Smith says:

"It seems to me that God's relation to the world and all of its multiform life is more essential, more constant, more intimate under the evolutionary than under the transcendentalist view." (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 9.)

Here, Dr. Smith needlessly sets the transcendence of God over against his immanence, rejecting the former and retaining only the latter. What does Dr. Smith mean by the immanence of God? No doubt just what the term ordinarily means by those who hold to the doctrine of evolution. What that is, Dr. Robert E. Speer shall tell us. Speaking of "original and authentic Christianity," Dr. Speer says: "It was not bounded by the modern world view which knows only an immanent God, part of, identified with and enclosed in His own creation." [*The Finality of Jesus Christ*, p. 40.] Of course, Dr. Speer himself rejects this doctrine.

The immanence of God as conceived and held by Dr. Smith obscures and logically involves a denial of the doctrine of creation, of the doctrine of the personality of God, of the doctrine of God's providence, and of all miracles, including the incarnation and the resurrection. Thus, speaking again in praise of evolution, Dr. Smith says: "Perhaps more than any other scientific generalization, it implies throughout the whole realm of nature, from atoms to suns and from the amoeba to man, the presence of immanent Creative Power. . . . It is merely the method or process by which the Creative Power in the universe, which we call God, works." [*Some Facts About Evolution*, p. 10, par. 2.] Here it will be seen that for the term "God" Dr. Smith employs the term "Creative Power." But a "power," even if called a "Creative Power" does not possess the attributes of personality; though, of course, personalities possess power. Thus, this change of terms, while it does not necessarily imply a denial of the personality, does always obscure the personality of God, and frequently, if not usually, leads those who use it to lose sight of, and, practically, if not actually, to deny the existence of God, for that denial is necessarily implied when personality is denied.

Passing by much that might—much, perhaps, that ought to be said, I shall only add that the Scriptures and our Standards teach both the transcendence and the immanence of God. They teach the former when they assert that "God created all things out of noth-

ing"; when they assert that the universe had a beginning, that it owes its being to God, who existed in the perfection of His godhood, prior to and apart from it. They teach with equal clearness the immanence of God, when they speak of the omnipresence of God, that is, of His being everywhere present throughout the vast immeasurable sweep of His universe, and say that "in Him all things consist," that is, are continued in existence and in orderly relation one to another; when they teach the providential government of God, that is, "His most holy, wise and powerful preserving and governing all His creatures and all their actions."

But, it will be seen at once that this doctrine of God's immanence is as different from that held by Dr. Smith as light is from darkness. It does not identify God with the creature, recognizing, if any, only a quantitative difference between God and the creature. It does not rob God of the free control of the works of His hands, but, with our Confession, recognizes that "God hath most sovereign dominion over them to do by them, for them, or upon them whatsoever he pleaseth." The practical bearing of Dr. Smith's view of the immanence of God appears, as we shall see in connection with his views of the deity of Christ.

3. Facts Revealed in Regard to Dr. Smith's View of Reprobation, or, As I Would Prefer to Say, Preterition.

Dr. S.'s next *admitted divergence* from the teachings of our Standards relates to the doctrine of preterition. As stated in our Standards, this doctrine reads:

> "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." (C. F. III, 7.)

Of this doctrine, Dr. Smith says:

> "The third Chapter of the Confession has caused much discussion, chiefly because of the statement that, 'By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are . . . foreordained to everlasting death.' If this statement can be reconciled with the divine love and purpose as revealed

in such declarations as that 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life,' the expression perhaps loses its objectionableness. But I believe, and I would insist, that God's desire that all men should repent and be saved, from sin and all its consequences, is just as sincere as your desire and mine that our children shall grow up in his likeness and service. If the attitude of Christ is the attitude of God, as I believe it to be, there can be no mental reservation in his desire for the coming of all men to him in faith and love; no offer of his mercy, while consciously withholding the power to accept it. Any discussion of this question, however, leads to the mystery of sin, of which there is no solution." (P. & P. p. 9, 10.)

This is not the place either to explain or to defend this doctrine. It is enough to say that preterition is obviously a necessary corallary of the doctrine of unconditional election, and, like that "high mystery," is taught in our Standards, because it is taught also in the Scriptures. (Ro. 9:19-23.)

The facts revealed by Dr. Smith's statement are:

(1) Dr. Smith's apparently hopeless inability to think clearly upon theological subjects. This appears from the "if's" that characterize this statement, and from the fact that, when he gets to the close of his statement, he recognizes what he might have recognized at the beginning, namely, that the doctrine of preterition, like the doctrine of unconditional election, "leads to the mystery of sin, of which there is no solution." Admitting the fact of sin, as all must do, then the scriptural teaching as to God's dealings with a lost race, especially their teachings about election, furnish the only ground of hope for that lost race.

(2) Dr. Smith's statement also reveals an ignorance as to the teaching of the Presbyterian Church and the practice of Presbyterian ministers in reference to God's indiscriminate offers of mercy, which, considering the special advantages he had enjoyed, was as amazing as it was inexcusable: indeed, was an ignorance which in and of itself ought to have made it impossible for him to be admitted to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church.

4. FACTS REVEALED IN REGARD TO DR. SMITH'S VIEW OF ORIGINAL SIN.

Dr. Smith's next admitted divergence from the teachings of our

Standards relates to man's total inability to anything spiritually good, which Dr. Smith speaks of as "total depravity."

The completest statement of this doctrine in our Standards is that found in the answer to the 25th question in the Larger Catechism. This reads:

> "The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is SPIRITUALLY GOOD, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually; which is commonly called original sin, and from whcih do proceed all actual transgressions."

I have capitalized the words *spiritually good*, because they are the recognized key to a correct understanding of the teaching of our Standards.

Of this doctrine, Dr. Smith says:

(a) "The doctrine of the Confession with which I find myself in sharpest disaccord is that popularly known as total depravity —the words not occurring, however, in the Westminster Standards. *It is not easy to learn from expounders of Calvinism just what these words import—just what the doctrine really teaches.* If by total depravity were meant that the effects of sin are felt in every part of man's nature, total meaning throughout the whole extent of, there would be nothing to object to in the doctrine. But the statements in the Confession admit of no such mild interpretation as this. *While the words 'total depravity' are not used in the Confession, the thing is defined with a clearness and an unreserve that puts the meaning of the framers beyond all dispute.* 'From this original corruption,' says the Confession, 'whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.' Opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil—these phrases describe, not an unregenerate child or man, as we ordinarily think of him, but a degenerate. I can think of no more adequate description of an utter degenerate or moral reprobate than to say that he is 'opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil,' 'and,' as the Larger Catechism adds, 'that continually.'" (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 10.)

(b) "What is more, I do not believe that one person in a

thousand in the Southern Presbyterian Church accepts in good faith this view of human nature." (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 11.)

The facts revealed by a comparison of the teachings of our Standards and Dr. Smith's statements are:

(1) That Dr. Smith is correct in saying that the term "total depravity" is not found in our Standards. Neither are the ideas that Dr. Smith insists are taught in connection with the doctrine of man's "*total inability*" to anything spiritually good found in our Standards. To say that a man is dead is to say that he is "utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all" the functions of life: it is to say that the principle of corruption is everywhere present and everywhere dominant in his physical frame. But to say either or both of these things of a man is not to say that his body is in the last stages of putrefaction. Indeed, the human body, even after it has come under the power of death, may be preserved from complete distintegration as long as the bodies of the embalmed Pharaohs have been. But, after death has supervened, the principle of dissolution is present in the human body, and unless restrained, will ultimately work its complete distintegration. And as soon as death is present, the human body is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all the functions of the living body. And so when the soul comes under the power of spiritual death it becomes "utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good; and wholly inclined to all evil and that continually."

(2) That, the more effectively to caricature the teachings of our Standards, Dr. Smith did not hesitate to garble, that is, to falsify, their teachings by omitting from the quotation from the *Larger Catechism* the words "spiritually good," though these words are manifestly intended to be the key to the meaning of the statement of the Catechism as a whole.

(3) Taken in connection with his special opportunities for acquiring a true knowledge of the teachings of our Standards, Dr. Smith's statement reveals the fact that he was either hopelessly incapable of understanding this doctrine of our common Christianity as held by the Presbyterian Church, or else that he was blindly and

incurably antagonistic to it, and so in either case disqualified for the ministry in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

(4) That Dr. Smith, as it were, went out of his way to asperse the intelligence or the good faith of the office-bearers of our church, including, of course, the members of Arkansas Presbytery then before him, all of whom have affirmed under the sanction of an ordination vow their acceptance of a doctrine which Dr. Smith declared that "not one in a thousand accepts in good faith."

I pass over the mode of baptism.

5. Facts Revealed by Supplementary Statements of Dr. Smith.

Having expressed himself in regard to the particular doctrines in our Standards already mentioned, Dr. Smith went on to say:

> "In every age, and in every branch of the Church, there have been theologians who have been wise above what is written; who have passed from the simple statements of the New Testment into the region of metaphysical or philosophical speculation. To what extent these speculations are true, I have no idea. For example, I believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and I believe that Christ was Son of man and Son of God—human and divine. The words of Christ, and the facts necessitate such a belief. But when we endeavor to penetrate below these statements and facts, and to determine the metaphysical relations of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, or of the human and the divine in Christ, postulating two natures and declaring just how they are related, we are, in my judgment, entirely beyond our depth; we have passed from the ethical and religious to the metaphysical and philosophical; from Christ to the schools. Let me not be misunderstood. I have no desire to deny the truth of these speculations. I simply affirm that I *know* (italics original) nothing about them. It may be that Christ had two wholly distinct natures; but for my part I do not know what 'nature' is, either human or divine; or whether man being made in the image of God, there is any essential difference between human nature and divine nature. I am simply not qualified to make assertions of belief in the region of metaphysics." (P. & P. p. 13.)

I have quoted at length in order to do Dr. Smith no injustice.

The facts revealed by this statement are:

(1) That it leaves the reader of it largely in the dark as to what

and how many of the doctrines of our Standards are in Dr. Smith's judgment mere human speculations: speculations which, perhaps, are well enough in their way, but speculations which are "wise above what is written," and which, instead of truly interpreting the simple statements of the New Testament as our Standards claim to do, darken and distort those statements. That Dr. Smith has left its application undefined only adds gravity to this charge sufficiently grave in itself.

(2) That in Dr. Smith's judgment the doctrines of the Trinity and the Person of Christ are examples of the purely human speculations found in our Standards. This, of course, will necessarily affect the doctrines of the Deity of Christ and His mediatorial work, as taught in our Standards, and, along with them, the doctrine of justification, not to mention others. Indeed, just where its effect on our doctrinal system as a whole would stop is hard to say.

(3) That the positive affirmation of the chairman of the Commission of 1929 to the contrary notwithstanding, Dr. Smith does not and in 1912 did not accept the doctrines of the Trinity, or the Deity of Christ, or of the Person of Christ, as these doctrines are taught in our Standards. When in his communication in *The Arkansas Gazette* of May 10, 1930, without qualification and without warrant, the chairman said that Dr. Smith believed the doctrines of the Trinity and the Deity of Christ, he quotes Dr. Smith's words given above: "I believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy spirit; and I believe that Christ was Son of man and Son of God—human and divine." But as Dr. Hodge truly says:

> "If a man professes to receive the doctrine of the trinity, the word must be taken in its Christian sense. The candidate cannot substitute for that sense the Sabellian idea of a modal trinity, nor the philosophical trichotomy of Pantheism." (*Polity*, p. 319.)

(4) That Dr. Smith's whole tendency of thought is pantheistic. This appears when he says: "For my part, I do not know what nature is, either human or divine; or *whether man being made in the image of God, there is any essential difference between human nature and divine nature.*" That is to say, Dr. Smith in 1912 was still undecided as to whether the difference between God and man was

not, after all, merely a quantitative rather than a qualitative difference.

This is another indication of the confused character of Dr. Smith's theological thinking that ought to have made it impossible for Arkansas Presbytery to have received him into its membership and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church.

6. Facts Revealed by Other Supplementary Statements.

In concluding his paper, Dr. Smith made several supplementary statements that call for attention:

A. One reads as follows:

> "This is all, members of Presbytery, that I have to say of my divergencies from the Westminster Standards. I have not spoken of them because I regard them as of the *slightest* (italics original) importance. In my own opinion they touch nothing vital." (*Prestige and Perquisites,* p. 15.)

This statement reveals the following facts:

1. That Dr. Smith himself did not attach the slightest importance to his doctrinal divergencies from the teachings of our Standards.

2. That the reason that he did not attach any importance to them was because, in his judgment, his doctrinal divergences did not touch anything "vital." But, if the doctrines of Scripture, of God, of Creation, of Preterition, of Original Sin, of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ, together with doctrines inseparably connected with them, which Dr. Smith's divergences certainly touch, are, to use his phrase, "nothing vital," then there is nothing vital in our Standards.

B. Another of Dr. Smith's supplementary statements reads:

> "It has seemed to me that Calvinism has both a body and a soul.
>
> "Its body is that system of doctrine which found its ablest exponent in Calvin, and its clearest and most succinct expression in the Confession of Faith. To what extent I am a Calvinist, so far as the body, the doctrinal system is concerned, I really find it hard to say." (P. & P. pp. 15, 16.)

It is clear from this statement that the Calvinistic element in our Standards was not a just and true exhibition of Dr. Smith's faith in

regard to the matters it includes. Here, it is well that we bear in mind a statement of Dr. Henry B. Smith, a professor of theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, in the better days of that institution. Speaking of subscription to the Confession of Faith, he says:

> "The right theory (of subscription) is found in a simple and honest interpretation of the ordination formula, that we receive the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. This declares that the system of the Confession is the system taught in the Bible. The system of the Confession, as everybody knows, is the Reformed, or Calvinistic system in distinction from the Lutheran or Arminian, the Antinomian, the Pelagian and the Roman Catholic. No one can honestly and fairly subscribe to the Confession of Faith who does not accept the Reformed or Calvinistic system. This is the plain sense of the Adopting Act of 1729. Everybody knows that the 'fair historical sense' of the Confession is plainly and resolutely Calvinistic. . . . Among honest and candid men, there is no doubt or question as to what subscription implies." (Cited in *Commentary on the Confession of Faith* by A. A. Hodge, p. 543.)

C. A third supplementary statement reads:

> "I accept, for substance, the great doctrines of evangelical belief." (*Prestige and Perqeusites,* p. 16.)

This statement reveals the fact that nobody knows or can know how much of any of the great doctrines of evangelical belief Dr. Smith accepts. "For substance" is something purely subjective. It is something that lies exclusively within the consciousness of the person who uses the phrase. It leaves those who hear it to ascertain as best they can what it actually means. In the case of Dr. Smith, I regret to say, it seems to have meant very little. The whole tone of his thinking is reflected in such a statement, for instance, as this: "And all this has been done, professedly, in the name of One who reduced religion to two fundamental principles." [*Comments,* etc., p. 5.] This statement of itself seems to indicate that Dr. Smith is almost as ignorant of evangelical belief as if he had never heard of a New Testament.

D. Another supplementary statement, and the last that I shall notice, reads as follows:

"If the doctrine of total depravity, as so clearly defined in the Confession, be essential to the integrity of the body, the system, of Calvinism, I am not a Calvinist. And what is more, the Southern Presbyterian Church is not Calvinistic. Popular expositions of Calvinism are either silent as to its harsher features, or in explaining them they explain away the very thing that makes the doctrines distinctively Calvinistic. I have never seen or heard an exposition of total depravity that does not make it a different thing from what it is in the Confession. (P. & P. p. 16.)

The fact revealed by this statement is that standing in the presence of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912, Dr. Smith aspersed either the intelligence or the good faith of the Presbyterian Church as a whole, including, of course, that of the members of Arkansas Presbytery to whom his words were addressed. Every member of that body had affirmed under the sanction of a solemn ordination vow that he accepted the Calvinistic element in our Standards, along with the other doctrines of those Standards, as a just and true exhibition of his personal faith.

v. FACTS REVEALED BY THE FOLLOWING MINUTE ENTERED ON ITS RECORD BY ARKANSAS PRESBYTERY AT ITS REGULAR SPRING MEETING AT COTTON PLANT, ARK., APRIL, 1912, AND APPROVED WHEN ITS MINUTES WERE APPROVED.

Said minute reads:

"Fourth Day. That the call from the Second Church, Little Rock, for the pastoral services of Rev. Hay Watson Smith be lodged in the hands of the Stated Clerk." . . . "Rev. Hay Watson Smith, of Manhatan Association, came before the Presbytery and was examined according to the Book of Church Order. His examination was sustained. Rev. A. F. Cunningham was excused from voting. Mr. Smith was received and signed the *Ex Animo Declaration,* and his name was enrolled."

This extract from the Minutes of Arkansas Presbytery is a correct copy from one given by J. C. Hanna, Stated Clerk of Said Presbytery, to Rev. A. Killough in a letter to the latter written under date of Little Rock, Ark., April 17, 1930, which reads as follows:

"My dear Mr. Killough: I am enclosing the copy I made from the Minutes of Arkansas Presbytery regarding the Hay Watson Smith matter. This was all there was in the Minutes

that I could find bearing on the case. I trust it may be of some help to you. I think C. M. Campbell took off a copy of this. I do not know that I will have any need of it so you needn't return it, but it might be well to preserve it for future reference. [For complete text see Appendix B.]

"Sincerely yours, J. A. Hanna, Stated Clerk."

The facts revealed by this extract are:

1. That Dr. Smith was received into the membership of Arkansas Presbytery and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. at the Spring Meeting of Arkansas Presbytery, April, 1912.

2. That Arkansas Presbytery made no reference whatever in its record to the paper read before it by Dr. Smith, a paper which was practically made by Dr. Smith a condition of his application for admission into said Presbytery. That is to say, this minute shows that Arkansas Presbytery suppressed the fact that it had received Dr. Smith into its membership and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. with a full knowledge of the fact that his doctrinal views were out of accord with the teachings of our Standards in the particulars above mentioned.

3. That in so doing, Arkansas Presbytery violated the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. in that:

(1) Said Constitution requires our Presbyteries "to keep a full and fair record of their proceedings" [BCO, par. 77], that is to say such a record as will enable the superior courts intelligently to review the proceedings of the lower courts and to determine "(2) whether they (the proceedings) have been regular and in accordance with the Constitution; (3) whether they (the proceedings) have been wise, equitable and suited to promote the welfare of the church." (BCO, par. 262.)

(2) Said Constitution requires as a condition *sine qua non* to the reception of any applicant for admission into the membership of its constituent Presbyteries, that he sincerely receive and adopt "the system of doctrine" and "principles of government" set forth in it as a just and true exhibition of his own faith and principles.

4. That, in thus violating the Constitution, Arkansas Presbytery betrayed the confidence reposed in it as its trusted agent by the

Presbyterian Church in the U. S., and broke faith with its sister Presbyteries.

5. That in so doing, it betrayed the confidence reposed in it by Dr. Smith, in that it is evident that he acted upon the assumption that the Presbytery was the absolute and final judge of the qualifications of its members, whereas in reality, in this particular matter, the Presbytery is only the judge as to whether the applicant for admission into its membership possesses the qualifications required in the Constitution, a matter in regard to which the Constitution gives the Presbytery no absolute and final discretionary power whatever.

6. That it permitted and required Dr. Smith to sign the ordination obligation, which, in this case, would read: "I, Hay Watson Smith, do sincerely receive and subscribe to the above obligation as a just and true exhibition of my faith and principles, and do resolve and promise to exercise my ministry in conformity thereto:" and that, in so doing, it encouraged Dr. Smith to, and abetted him in, the sin of "moral perjury."

7. That, in entering in its *Minutes* the statement "Mr. Smith . . . signed the *Ex Animo Declaration*," Arkansas Presbytery suggested what was false, in that in the context in which this statement occurs, it was suited to suggest and does suggest that in his examination before Presbytery Dr. Smith had given Arkansas Presbytery oral assurance that he sincerely accepted and adopted as a just and true exhibition of his own faith and principles the system of doctrine and the principles of government contained in our Standards; whereas, when it entered this statement in its *Minutes*, and later approved its *Minutes*, Arkansas Presbytery knew that the system of doctrine contained our Standards was not a just and true exhibition of the faith of Dr. Smith.

8. That, by its action in receiving Dr. Smith into its membership and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. in 1912, Arkansas Presbytery violated its ordination vow in that said action was obviously prejudicial both to the purity and to the peace of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

9. The whole record, therefore, reveals the fact by its action

in 1912 Arkansas Presbytery set an example of gross disregard for solemn covenant obligations that constitutes a menace to public morals; that it discredited the importance of all the great truths in regard to which Dr. Smith declared himself to be out of accord with the teachings of our Standards; that it brought into suspicion the good faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. as to its own real acceptance of the system of doctrines to which in its Constitution it professes to have committed itself; that it brought upon itself deep dishonor and aggravated guilt by its betrayal of the confidence reposed in it both by Dr. Smith and by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., and by its violation of its solemn covenant vows; that it did a great wrong to the Presbyterian Church and brought upon it great dishonor, unless and until said church publicly sets the seal of its disapproval on said action of Arkansas Presbytery.

Such, then, is the nature and extent of the guilt in which Arkansas Presbytery in 1930 involved itself by making the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 the basis of its own action with reference to the rumors abroad concerning Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness.

B. Facts Revealed by Report of Commission As to Action of Commission in 1930.

i. FACTS REVEALED BY SEC. I OF REPORT ("PRINCIPLES OF PROCEDURE.")

(i) Facts Revealed by Sec. I, Par. 1.

This paragraph reads:

> "Bearing in mind that we are under the sacred obligation to maintain the purity and peace of the Church, and that the power which Christ has given the Church is for building up and not for destruction, we have endeavored to make the investigation in fidelity to the truth, in fairness to Dr. Smith, and in a way that would promote the honor of the Church."

The facts revealed by this statement are:

1. That the Commission itself recognized that those reading its Report were entitled to expect that the Commission would make its investigation in fidelity to the truth, in fairness to Dr. Smith, and in a way that would promote the purity, peace and honor of the Church. It should be added that those reading the Report of the

Commission had a right also to expect that that report would reveal that the investigation had been made not only in fairness to Dr. Smith, but in fairness to those who made themselves responsible for reports regarding Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness.

2. That the language used is suited and was designed to create in the minds of those hearing or reading the Report the conviction that the Commission was conscious of the gravity of its task, and had used reasonable endeavors to make the investigation in accordance with the high but proper standard which it set for itself.

(ii) Facts Revealed By Sec. I, Par. 3.

This paragraph reads:

> "The investigation has been made upon the basis of Dr. Smith's sermons, pamphlets and written statements, especial attention being given to his statement before the Presbytery at the time of his reception in 1912. These writings of Dr. Smith represent his views, they form the basis of the rumors, and we have endeavored to test them by the Scriptures as they are interpreted in the doctrinal standards of our Church. In addition to this, we have had frequent correspondence with Dr. Smith and have taken pains to find out more fully than his writings reveal what his views on the great doctrines of our Church really are." [*Min.*, April 8-9, 1930, p. 21.]

This paragraph includes three distinct statements.

1. "The investigation has been made upon the basis of Dr. Smith's sermons, pamphlets and written statements, *especial attention being given to his statement* before the Presbytery of Arkansas at the time of his reception in 1912."

This language is suited, and presumably was designed to make the impression that the Report of the Commission covers all the statements in Dr. Smith's writings having any immediate bearing on the question of his doctrinal soundness, and especially those contained in the paper that he read before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912.

2. "The writings of Dr. Smith represent his views, they form the basis of the rumors, and we have endeavored to test them by the Scriptures as they are interpreted in the doctrinal Standards of our Church."

The language of this statement reveals the fact that the Commission recognized that it was under obligation to test the sound-

ness of Dr. Smith's views (1) by the Scriptures as they are interpreted in the doctrinal standards of our Church; and (2) that it is suited and was designed to create the impression that the Commission did so test Dr. Smith's views. These matters will come up in connection with the consideration of the test actually applied by the Commission and with their application of that test.

3. The last statement reads:

> "In addition to this (that is, in addition to the Commission's examination of Dr. Smith's views as represented in his writings) we have had frequent correspondence with Dr. Smith and have taken pains to find out more fully than his writing reveal what his views on the great doctrines of our Church really are."

This statement is suited and presumably was designed to create the impression (1) that such was the zeal of the Commission to conform its work to the high standard it had set for itself, that it was not content merely to make a careful study of Dr. Smith's writings, but put itself to the further trouble of a somewhat extended ("frequent") correspondence with Dr. Smith regarding his doctrinal views; (2) that as a result of this correspondence it got light that revealed more fully than his writings had the nature of those views; (3) that the Commission in its Report *availed* itself of *all the light obtainable both from Dr. Smith's writings and from its correspondence with him.*

Facts Revealed by An Examination of the Records Bearing Upon the Above Claims of the Commission.

1. The Report of the Commission reveals the fact that so far from taking account of all of Dr. Smith's doctrinal views, the Commission did not even take account of all Dr. Smith's admitted divergences from the teachings of our Standards contained in the paper read before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912, to which paper the Commission claims that it paid special attention. That is to say, the Report of the Commission takes no account of the fact that by Dr. Smith's own admission, he was, in 1912, out of accord with the teachings of our Standards in regard to the doctrines of the Trinity, of the Person of Christ, of God's transcendence, of Preterition, of Original Sin, and the Calvinistic element in our Standards. Said Report further shows that the Commission took no account of many subse-

quent erroneous doctrinal statements of Dr. Smith found in his sermon of June 9, 1930, his pamphlet entitled *Evolution and Presbyterianism,* and in his pamphlet *Comments on the Letters of Dr. W. M. McPheeters and Dr. J. P. Robertson.*

2. An examination of the "frequent" correspondence that the Commission alleges that it had with Dr. Smith relative to his doctrinal views reveals the following facts:

(1) That said frequent correspondence consisted of *just two* letters addressed by the chairman of the Commission to Dr. Smith.

The first of these letters is dated March 17, 1930. In it, the chairman requests of Dr. Smith an expression of his views on certain specific doctrines. On March 21, 1930, Dr. Smith replied to this letter and gave the information that the chairman had requested. The information contained in this letter, it seems, was unsatisfactory to the Commission; for on April 6, 1930, the chairman wrote again to Dr. Smith and asked him for "a little fuller statement" of his views on all but one of the doctrines mentioned in his (the chairman's) former letter. I may remark in passing that the chairman not only asks for light from Dr. Smith on these doctrines, but seeks to wheedle from Dr. Smith answers that will be more satisfactory to the Commission than Dr. Smith's previous answers had been. In a letter dated April 7, 1930, Dr. Smith replied to the chairman's letter of April 6, and, instead of giving the fuller information requested, Dr. Smith contents himself with commenting upon the "futility" of the questions asked by the chairman.

The text of the chairman's letter of April 6 has already been given (p. 9) with sufficient fullness, but the text of Dr. Smith's letter of March 21, 1930, to the chairman is of so much importance that it is only fair to him, the chairman and myself that I give its full text, and call special attention to the ninth paragraph, beginning "This letter has been dictated hastily." The letter reads:

"I have read your letter of the 17th over two or three times very carefully. It is a splendid letter.

"I regret that I shall be out of the city next week. I am going to New York to have a conference with Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, Dr. James Moffatt, and Dr. William Adams Brown. I need the

advice and counsel of men in whose Christian spirit and in whose scholarship I have confidence.

"Let me say that I believe no man in Arkansas Presbytery, or in the Southern Presbyterian Church, has preached Christ and Him crucified more consistently than I have. I believe that there is only one thing that makes a man a Christian, and that is, getting into his heart and practicing in his life the spirit of Jesus Christ. I have come to see very clearly that neither assent to, nor dissent from, any certain theological system is a guarantee of the presence in a man's life of that spirit. The mind of Christ is deeper and finer and more searching than any theological system.

"In your letter you ask about my view of the Deity of Christ. I have never had any doubt, nor have I ever expressed any, about the divinity of Christ. I recall that Mrs. _____ once told me that a sermon that I preached on that subject was the strongest that she has ever heard in her life. *However, I would probably not interpret divinity by means of some of the old categories. I think it is qualitative rather than quantitative.* My view is pretty well expressed by Dr. Baillie in his book, 'The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity.'

"When I came into Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 Dr. _____ was a member of the Presbytery. After hearing my paper he asked me whether I believed in the divinity of Christ, and when I answered that I did, he said that was all he wanted to know. Dr. _____ recalls the incident.

"You ask about my view of the inspiration of the Bible. I have not, and never have had, a shadow of doubt about the inspiration of the Scripture, but I do not believe that inspiration means infallibility or inerrancy.

"Of course, I hold that all men are sinful. Who doesn't?

"As to the saving power of Christ, I believe that a man is saved just to the extent in which his life is controlled by the profound and beautiful spirit of the Founder of our religion. Salvation seems to me to be a progressive thing.

"Practically all of my theology is found in the words of Paul: 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.' In that statement is all the theology and Christology that I want. It involves, of course, the incarnation and the atonement.

"This letter has been dictated hastily and of course does not express in any adequate way my thoughts about the matters concerning which you ask in your letter. If it does not prove satisfactory, you will have to have an interview with me.

"As for the insulting letters which I have received, I am enclosing one that I think will be sufficient. I have also from a minister in Arkansas Presbytery as insulting letters as I have ever received. I will submit them to the Commission if you desire to see them.

"I am also enclosing a letter from Dr. _____. It will serve to represent the class of men in the Southern Church who are in sympathy with my effort to bring to our ministers greater liberty of thought and speech. Please return these letters at your leisure.

"I hope that your Commission may be guided by such a spirit of wisdom that its report may conduce for the peace and prosperity of our Church and the kingdom of God.

"With every good wish, etc.

"P. S. I am enclosing also a letter from Rev. _____. I have scores of letters of this kind.

"H. W. S."

The only other letter in which Dr. Smith gives any light on his doctrinal views was not elicited by the Commission, but written on Dr. Smith's own initiative. In it Dr. Smith informs the chairman that his views on the Person of Christ are the same as those of Drs. Mackintosh, Paterson and Baillie; and that his views upon "the literary history and structure of the Bible" are the same as those of Dr. _____. He enters into no details whatever. He leaves the Commission to examine for itself the writings of the Christian scholars to whom he refers. Whether it did so or not, does not appear. If it did, it got information upon the two points mentioned, but only upon those two.

(2) As to the extent of the information secured, the correspondence reveals the fact that it was limited to light upon Dr. Smith's views on the Deity of Christ, the Inspiration of Scripture, the Sinfulness of man, the Atoning work of Christ, and Justification by faith, or, as expressed by the chairman in his letter of March 17, 1930, the Saving Power of Christ.

The record thus shows that it was *only on these five doctrines* that the Commission sought light in its correspondence with Dr. Smith; and that it was only in regard to them, and Dr. Smith's views on the Person of Christ that it received any.

From this it appears that in its "frequent" correspondence with Dr. Smith, the Commission did not make any inquiry whatever in regard to the doctrinal errors with which Dr. Smith was informally charged in the rumors referred to it, nor in regard to his views upon any of the following doctrines upon all of which Dr. Smith expressed himself in his writings: the Trinity, God's transcendence, the changes of view in regard to the origin of man, the origin of sin, the nature of sin and man's moral accountability, and the Atonement, which, according to Dr. Smith, are necessitated by his doctrine of "theistic evolution." It did not seek for more light in regard to Dr. Smith's views on unconditional election and its corollary, preterition; or upon original sin; or upon his attitude toward the Calvinistic element that is the distinctive feature of our system of doctrine; or upon that system of doctrine as a whole; or upon the principles of church government set forth in our Standards.

3. The value of the light obtained by this correspondence may be inferred from the following facts revealed by the record:

(1) That when the Commission met for its first session March 24-25, 1930, after spending the major part of two days in considering Dr. Smith's views on the Deity of Christ, the Scriptures, reprobation and "Total Depravity," it was unable to arrive at any agreement as to what it should report, except in regard to the Scriptures, (*Min.*, pp. 25-27.)

(2) That, as we have seen, on April 6 the chairman wrote again to Dr. Smith, asking for a little fuller statement of the latter's views on these doctrines: to which, as we have also seen, Dr. Smith replied by calling the attention of the chairman to the "futility" of his [the chairman's] questions.

From all of the above, it appears that there is a marked contrast and a sharp antithesis between the impressions that the Commission sought to make in the statements above quoted, and those made by the facts as revealed in the correspondence, the Minutes, and the Report of the Commission. In view of this contrast and antithesis, the reader can judge whether or not the facts bear out the claim of the Commission that its investigation was made "in fidelity to the truth."

ii. FACTS REVEALED BY SEC. II OF REPORT ("ESSENTIAL DOCTRINES.")

(i) Facts Revealed by Sec. II, Par. 1. The Test.

This paragraph reads:

> "We concerned ourselves especially with Dr. Smith's views respecting the Deity of Christ, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Sinfulness of Man, the Atoning Work of Christ and Salvation by Faith. These doctrines we consider a fair and sufficient test of a minister's soundness in the faith."

The contents of this paragraph reveal the following facts:

1. That, instead of bringing Dr. Smith's views to the only test known to our Constitution, namely, "the system of doctrine" taught in the Scriptures as interpreted in our Standards, that is, in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the Commission deliberately set aside this test, and substituted for it a test of its own devising, thus making the Commission itself the judge of what constitutes a fair and sufficient test of a man's soundness in the faith. Of course, soundness upon the five doctrines enumerated by the Commission is essential to soundness in the faith as understood and construed by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. But certainly these are not the only doctrines in regard to which the views of one seeking admission to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church must be sound. It really looks as if the Commission were unaware of the fact that the Presbyterian Church holds or professes to hold, together with the other Reformed Churches, the doctrines comprehended under the term Calvinism: that it holds in connection with all the great historic evangelical churches the doctrine of the Trinity, of Creation, of Man's Fall, of Original Sin, of the Person and Work of Christ, of Regeneration, of the Resurrection of the Dead, and of a Final Judgment. One is led to infer from the test proposed by the Commission that it agrees with Dr. Smith that his erroneous views in regard to the doctrines peculiar to Calvinism and all the doctrines held by the Reformed churches, along with other great evangelical churches, are not matters of "the *slightest* importance." That errors touching this long list of doctrines touch "nothing vital."

2. An examination of the Report of the Commission will show that it did not test Dr. Smith's views in regard to the Deity of

Christ, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Sinfulness of Man, and the Saving power of Christ (Atonement) by the teachings of our Standards, but, on the contrary, the facts are these:

(1) That the Minutes of the Commission and its Report will be searched in vain for a single specific reference to the Standards: the Standards are not quoted in the chairman's correspondence with Dr. Smith; they are not cited in the Minutes of the Commission; they are not cited in the Report of the Commission. The striking feature of the Report is the conspicuous absence of a comparison of Dr. Smith's views with the teachings of our Standards.

(2) That the Commission did not test the major portion of Dr. Smith's alleged departures from our Standards at all. It simply ignored and suppressed them.

(3) That what it actually did, so far as it made any pretense of testing Dr. Smith's views at all, was to test them—

(a) Sometimes by a purely subjective standard existing in its own mind, and inaccessible to anybody but itself;

(b) Sometimes it tested Dr. Smith's views by what the Commission, without any authority or justification, assumed to be the present, prevailing belief touching the doctrine under consideration. Thus, in connection with the doctrine of what it calls "total depravity," the Commission says: "The doctrine of total depravity to which Dr. Smith finds no objection, we believe to be in line with what is now believed and taught in the church." [*Min.*, p. 22, par. 5.] One cannot refrain from asking the question: Was the Commission authorized or qualified to speak for the ministers, elders and deacons of our Church?

(c) But the ultimate test by which the Commission determined the soundness of Dr. Smith's views was the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912. In its Minutes we read: "The Commission then resolved to proceed with the investigation upon the basis of Dr. Smith's written statements, *especially his statements before Arkansas Presbytery in* 1912." (*Min.*, p. 29, par. 2.) In its Report the Commission says:

"In conclusion, we would respectfully call the attention of Presbytery to *the fact that Dr. Smith made a clear and straight-*

forward statement of his views and the points of his divergence from the Confession and Catechisms of the Church at the time of his reception into the Presbytery in 1912, *and that the Presbytery did not deem his points of divergence as affecting the essential and necessary doctrines of the Church.*

"*We find that he has not substantially changed his views since then,* and that, in our opinion, the points of his divergence from our Standards are not of sufficient character to disqualify him from remaining a minister in good standing in the Presbyterian Church." (*Min.* p. 22, 23.)

These statements make it perfectly plain, I think, that the Commission assumed that the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 was a sufficient guaranty of Dr. Smith's doctrinal soundness in connection with the points covered by the paper that he read before the Presbytery at that time. In other words, it made that action its test of Dr. Smith's doctrinal soundness. What the Commission overlooked was the fact that in 1912 Arkansas Presbytery betrayed the trust reposed in it by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., whose agent it was, and, contrary to the Constitution of that Church and its own ordination vows, introduced Dr. Smith into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, regardless of the fact that the views that he had laid before the Presbytery in writing were clearly and plainly in contradiction of our Standards. In doing this, the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery in 1930 endorsed and made itself responsible for the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912.

Reverting now to the explicit statement of the Commission that it endeavored to test Dr. Smith's views by the Scriptures as they are interpreted in the doctrinal Standards of our church, we are prepared to judge how far that statement represents "fidelity to the truth."

(ii) Facts Revealed by Sec. II, Par. 2. Diety of Christ.

In regard to the Deity of Christ the Commission says:

"On many occasions Dr. Smith has affirmed his belief in the Deity of Christ. In his statement before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 he said: 'I believe in the Father, and the Son and in the Holy Spirit; and I believe that Christ was the Son of Man and Son of God—human and divine.' In a letter he says the sum and substance of his Theology and his Christology in this:

'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.'" (*Min.*, p. 21, par. 6.)

In considering this statement, it should be constantly borne in mind:

1. That the only matter that the Commission was appointed to pass upon was whether or not the evidence in the case raised "a strong presumption" of the correctness of the reports alleging a lack of accord between Dr. Smith's doctrinal views and the teachings of our Standards. If the evidence created such presumption, the Commission had no option but to report the fact, and the Presbytery had no option but to institute process. [BCO, par. 183.]

2. That we are entitled to assume and must assume that its statement just cited, was intended to justify the statement with which the Report closes—namely, that investigation has shown that the rumors abroad concerning Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness are, so far as the doctrine of the Deity of Christ is concerned, "without sufficient ground for further action on the part of Arkansas Presbytery." Or, to state the latter part somewhat differently, the statement is intended to show that an examination of his views on the Deity of Christ does not create a strong presumption that on this "essential" doctrine, Dr. Smith is out of accord wtih the teachings of our Standards. And hence:

3. That the statement of the Commission is a full and fair statement of Dr. Smith's views on the doctrine under consideration; that it takes account of the rumors and of any statements of Dr. Smith that have been or might reasonably be alleged to constitute *prima facie* evidence that his (Dr. Smith's) views are not in accord with the Scriptures. To suppress statements of Dr. Smith that on their face are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards or that have been alleged to show that Dr. Smith's views are out of accord with those teachings, and cite only such statements of Dr. Smith's as nobody has claimed, or would, or could reasonably claim are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards, would be to garble, that is, to falsify the evidence in the case.

Assuming, then, for the moment that the Commission has given

a full and fair statement of Dr. Smith's views, let us ask: Are they in accord with the teachings of our Standards? These teach that:

> "There are three persons in the Godhead; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." (S. C. Ans., to Ques. 6.)

From this it is evident that the teaching of our Standards regarding the Deity of Christ is inseparably bound up with its teachings regarding the Trinity and the Person of Christ. In regard to the Trinity, our Standards teach that in the unity of the Godhead, there are three persons, namely, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost; and that these three persons are the same in substance, equal in power and glory. Hence, when they come to speak of Christ, the Mediator, they speak of Him as "the Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father." [C. of F., Ch. VIII, II.] And when they come to speak of the Person of Christ, they say: "The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was and continueth to be, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person forever." (S. C. Ans. to Ques. 21.)

Dr. Smith as cited, and correctly cited, by the Commission says:

> "I believe in the Father, and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit; and I believe that Christ was the Son of Man and Son of God—human and divine."

Will anyone say that this language of Dr. Smith conveys the same idea in regard to the Trinity and the Person of Christ, and so in regard to the Deity of Christ, that is conveyed by the language cited from our Standards? If there were no other difference between them, the vagueness of the language employed by Dr. Smith would of itself sufficiently indicate that the two statements do not convey the same ideas. Will anyone affirm that the language of Dr. Smith cited by the Commission *was intended* to convey, however generally and vaguely, the ideas that our Standards convey in regard to the Deity of Christ? If so, why did not Dr. Smith employ the language of our Standards? But, we are not left here to surmise. In the very same paragraph from which the Commission cites the state-

ment "I believe, etc.," Dr. Smith makes it unmistakably plain that he did not intend these words to convey the ideas conveyed in our Standards. He says:

> "In every age, and in every branch of the Church, there have been theologians who have been wise above what is written; who have passed from the simple statements of the New Testament into the region of metaphysical or philosophical speculation. To what extent these speculations are true, I have no idea. For example, I believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and I believe that Christ was Son of man and Son of God—human and divine. . . . . But when we endeavor to penetrate below these statements and facts, and to determine and define the metaphysical relations of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or of the human and the divine in Christ, postulating two natures and declaring just how they are related, we are, in my judgment, entirely beyond our depth; we have passed from the ethical and religious to the metaphysical and philosophical; from Christ to the schools." (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 13.)

From this, it is obvious that Dr. Smith intended to place his statement of the Deity of Christ in contrast with the statement given in our Standards. He characterizes the latter as "metaphysical and philosophical" in contrast with "the simple statements of the New Testament," and with his own, which he speaks of as "ethical and religious": he characterizes the teachings of our Standards as an instance in which those framing them were "wise above what is written."

But, Dr. Smith's statement does not end here. He says:

> "Let me not be misunderstood. I have no desire to deny the truth of these speculations. I simply affirm that I know nothing about them. It may be that Christ had two absolutely distinct natures, but for my part, I do not know what 'nature' is, either human or divine, or *whether man, being made in the image of God, there is any essential difference between human nature and divine nature.* I am simply not qualified to make assertions of belief in the region of metaphysics." (*Ibid p.* 13.)

Now, it will be recalled that this was one of the doctrines upon which the Commission asked for information and upon which it got information from Dr. Smith himself. Let us hear, then, what

Dr. Smith himself has to say in regard to his views on the Deity of Christ:

"In your letter you ask about my view of the Deity of Christ. I have never had any doubt, nor have I ever expressed any, about the divinity of Christ. . . . . However, I would probably not interpret divinity by means of some of the old categories. I think it is qualitative rather than quantitative. My view is pretty well expressed by Dr. Baillie in his book, *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*." (Letter of Dr. Smith to Chairman of Committee, March 21, 1930.) It should be noted here that for the word "deity" Dr. Smith substitutes "divinity." Whether this change was intended to express a lower conception than expressed by the term "deity," I cannot say. But the fact of the change of terms remains.

On p. 135 of the above mentioned book the author (Dr. Baillie) says:

". . . . it is in Christ's very humanity, and not in some other nature which he had alongside of His humanity (however closely united with it) that God is to be found."

On pp. 135-136 of the same book he says:

"The Christian announcement is not that there once appeared in our world a prodigious being with two natures—two natures so disparate, so utterly unrelated, and heterogeneous that a miracle of sheer omnipotence is needed to unite them. The Christian announcement is quite centrally and essentially that God was made manifest to us in a Man—in a soul of like passions with our own, but controlled to finer needs, in a life of simple faith and quiet helpfulness lived out under human conditions in its own little niche of time and place, and in a cruel death bravely borne."

While we are considering what Dr. Baillie says, let me direct attention to another of his statements cited and commented on by Dr. Robert E. Speer:

" 'The true Christian teaching,' says Prof. Baillie, 'has never been that God is incarnate in Jesus alone, but that in Him He was incarnate supremely. Revelation and incarnation are no unique historical prodigies, but are, by God's grace, of the very warp and woof of our experience.' " On this statement of Prof. Baillie, Dr. Speer comments as follows: "Our conviction is otherwise, in the case of the revelation and Incarnation of Christ. We would not call them prodigies, but we would

call Him unique and historical, and not only supreme but solitary and supernatural." (*The Finality of Jesus Christ*, p. 249.)

Indeed, it is not too much to say that Dr. Baillie's volume represents Jesus Christ as a *temporal* person (ego), while the Scriptures as interpreted by the Westminster Standards present Him as an *eternal* person: "very and eternal God." With the foregoing facts before him, the reader can judge for himself as to whether Dr. Smith's views on this momentous subject are or are not in accord with the teachings of our Standards. And, in the light of the fact that the Commission suppressed Dr. Smith's own written statement of his views, the reader can judge for himself of the "fidelity to the truth" here manifested by the Commission.

(iii) Facts Revealed By Sec. II, Par. 3. The Scriptures.

Here the Commission says:

"Dr. Smith believes that they are the inspired revelation of God's will and character. He does not believe in the verbal infallibility or in the inerrancy of the Bible, but he affirms that it is the essential word of God to man." (*Min.*, p. 22, par. 2.)

It should be remembered that what the Commission here professes to do is to show that the rumors abroad concerning Dr. Smith's views of Scripture are without sufficient ground for further action on the part of Arkansas Presbytery. Did, then, any of those rumors allege that Dr. Smith denied the inspiration of Scripture? Did any of them allege that Dr. Smith denied that the Scriptures are what he calls "the essential word of God to man?"—whatever that phrase may mean. If not, the Commission is so far forth creating a false impression. Rev. F. Z. Browne did allege that Dr. Smith denied the "verbal inspiration" of Scripture, but no one that I know of affirmed that he denied the "verbal infallibility" of Scripture. No intelligent person that I know of holds to the "verbal infallibility" of Scripture, if by that is meant that the style and diction of the Scripture writers is faultless. On the contrary Drs. A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield say expressly:

"We do not deny an everywhere present human element in the Scriptures. No mark of the effect of this human element, therefore—in style of thought or wording—can be urged against inspiration (that is, verbal inspiration) unless it can

be shown to result in untruth." They say again: "No one claims that inspiration (verbal inspiration) secured the use of good Greek in Attic severity of taste, free from the exaggerations and looseness of current speech, but only that it secured the accurate expression of truth, even (if you will) through the medium of the worst Greek a fisherman of Galilee could write and the most startling figures of speech a peasant could invent. Exegesis must be historical as well as grammatical, and must always seek the meaning *intended,* not any meaning that can be tortured out of the passage." (*Inspiration* by Drs. A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield, pp. 42, 43.)

In other words, *the single point* at which the Commission's statement of Dr. Smith's views of Scripture touches the rumors that are abroad concerning his unsoundness on this doctrine is in the matter of inerrancy. And here the Commission indirectly admits that, if our Standards teach the inerrancy of Scriptures, then Dr. Smith is in conflict with our Standards. Apparently, it assumes that our Standards do not teach the inerrancy of Scripture. In this, I think, it is mistaken; but I do not care to argue the point.

What needs to be noted is that the Commission here deliberately ignored the charge made by Augusta Presbytery, namely, that Dr. Smith assails "the truthfulness of Scripture." The truthfulness of Scripture is one thing: its inerrancy is a very different thing. I alleged that Dr. Smith denied "the infallible truth and divine authority of the Scriptures."

Here again, we should remind ourselves that this was one of the doctrines upon which the Commission sought by frequent correspondence with Dr. Smith to ascertain his views more fully than his writings reveal. But its zeal for the truth does not induce it to state Dr. Smith's answer to its request for information on this point. What Dr. Smith has to say in response to the inquiry of the Commission is:

> "You ask my view of the inspiration of the Bible. I have not, and never have had a shadow of doubt about the inspiration of the Scriptures. *But I do not believe* that that inspiration means *infallibility* or inerrancy."

I am not quite sure whether Dr. Smith is here confusing infallibility and inerrancy or not. Even if he is, it is perfectly clear that he denies the "infallibility" of Scripture. Our Standards, on the

other hand, affirm "the infallible truth and divine authority of Scripture." (C. of F., Ch. I, V.) They go further and give what they consider to be an unanswerable argument to show that the Scriptures are "the Word of God," and hence "infallibly true and divinely authoritative." In this connection they say:

> "The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the Word of God." (C. of F., Ch. I, IV.) How could our Standards teach the truthfulness of Scripture more clearly or emphatically.

Dr. Smith on the contrary says expressly:

> "As to the literary history and structure of the Bible I have been carefully over both sides of this long drawn out controversy, and I accept the conclusions of the more conservative scholars—such as those set forth, for example, in *Hastings' Dic. of the Bible.*"

The late Dr. S. R. Driver, one of the most conservative of the school of scholars represented in *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible,* speaking of the matter contained in Gen. i-xi, says:

"These chapters contain no account of the real beginnings, either of the earth itself, or of man and human civilization upon it" [*Commentary on Gen. Westminster Series,* p. xlii]; and that, speaking of the patriarchal narratives in Gen. xii-1, he says: "We may, perhaps, succeed in finding a historic core in the patriarchal narratives." (*Op. Cit.* p. xlv.)

But as we have already seen (p. 1) Dr. Smith has explicitly committed himself to a view of the origin of Scripture that strips Genesis, for example, of all historicity.

I presume that the Commission is aware that our Lord speaks of Abraham as a historical person, and that the whole of the Pauline theology is built upon the assumption that there was a covenant between God and Abraham. It may be aware of the fact that the remainder of the Old Testament is simply a record of the unfolding of that covenant. If it is aware of these facts, it is careful to avoid bringing them to the attention of the readers of its Report, or itself taking any account of them.

Can anybody doubt that Dr. Smith's express statements in regard

to the Scriptures do raise a strong presumption that the reports alleging that his views are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards, are true? And yet, this Commission that tells us that it endeavored to shape its Report "in fidelity to the truth," here, by the suppression of the truth and the suggestion of what is false, creates in the mind of the uninformed reader of the Report an impression that is in direct contradiction of the truth.

(iv) Facts Revealed by Sec. II, Par. 4. Sinfulness of Man.

On this subject, the Commission says:

> "Dr. Smith objects to the doctrine of total depravity as it is stated in Chapter 6, Section 4, of the Confession, but he says: 'IF by total depravity were meant that the effects of sin are felt in every part of man's nature—total meaning throughout the whole extent of—there would be nothing to object to in the doctrine.' He believes that man is a sinner by nature and by practice, and that he is utterly unable to save himself." (*Minutes*, p. 22.)

Here again it should be remembered that the Commission is seeking to justify the language used in its answer to the injunction of the General Assembly. That is to say, it is here seeking to make the impression that there is nothing in Dr. Smith's views as to the sinfulness of man to create a strong presumption that on this doctrine he is out of accord with the teachings of our Standards. This, of course, implies that the Commission has given a full and fair statement of Dr. Smith's views as to the sinfulness of man. It also implies that it has taken account of the entire teaching of our Standards in regard to this subject. Obviously if it has failed in either particular, it has failed to justify the conclusion that there is nothing in Dr. Smith's writings to create a strong presumption that his views on the sinfulness of man are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards.

What are the facts? They are these: The Commission has quoted a hypothetical statement of Dr. Smith and has emphasized the fact that it is a hypothetical statement, and has supplemented this by certain statements of its own, which it does not support by any citation from the writings of Dr. Smith. The single statement cited from Dr. Smith's writings relates to a single paragraph in the chapter of the Confession from which the Commission quoted. In

other words, the Commission has not presented a full and fair statement of Dr. Smith's views on the sinfulness of man, nor has it presented a full and fair statement of the teachings of our Confession on this subject.

Further, it should be noted that the hypothetical statement cited by the Commission is in the form of an unreal conditional sentence, that is to say, the grammatical form of the statement indicates that the condition does not hold. It is also important to notice that the very language used by Dr. Smith and quoted by the Commission is suited to create a misapprehension as to the teaching of our Standards. As Dr. Smith himself says, the phrase "total depravity" is not found in the Confession. That is to say, the passage referred to by Dr. Smith treats not of the "total depravity" of man, but of the "total inability" of fallen man to perform any action whatever that is *spiritually* good. In other words, the Scriptures and our Standards teach that a man is dead in trespasses and sins, and that just as a dead man is wholly incompetent to perform any function of physical life, so one who is spiritually dead is totally incompetent to perform any function of spiritual life. It affirms a total absence of spiritual life from the soul of man, and presence and dominance in fallen man of a principle of spiritual corruption.

Our Lord uses a different figure from the apostle, but expresses the same idea when he said to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except one be born anew, (or from above), he cannot see the kingdom of God." He explained what He meant by adding: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (Jo. 3:3, 6.) Here our Lord sets the flesh and the spirit in sharp contrast one with the other—a contrast just as sharp as the contrast that in another connection He expresses by the antithesis between death and life, when He says: "Verily verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth Him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of *death into life.*" (Jo. 5:24.)

Our Standards, as I have already shown, do not teach that any man in his present state is as depraved as he can be. They do teach

that he is totally unable to perform any action that is spiritually good: they do teach that in the case of spiritual death, as in that of bodily death, all of the tendencies are toward increasing corrupton. But they also teach that God in his great mercy restrains these tendencies, so that they do not work themselves out fully, in the present life.

But to return to the matter immediately in hand. The Commission failed to call attention to the fact that Dr. Smith not only by the form of his sentence indicates that it is an unreal hypothesis that he is making, but that he says expressly that the "statements in the Confession admit of no such mild interpretation as this." (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 10.) The Commission also fails to take notice of the fact that in order to caricature the teachings of our Confession as he has done, Dr. Smith garbles—that is, falsifies those teachings. This he does by leaving out of his quotation of the Larger Catechism the key word of the passage quoted. His language is:

> "I can think of no more adequate description of an utter degenerate or moral reprobate than to say that he is 'opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil,' 'and,' as the Larger Catechism adds, 'that continually.'" (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 10.)

What the *Larger Catechism* actually says is that man "is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is *spiritually* good, and inclined to all evil and that continually." That shows perfectly plainly that the Standards in this connection are not speaking about what we call natural virtues. That they recognize in unregenerate men, that is, in men who are spiritually dead and who, because spiritually dead, are utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all spiritual good, the existence of natural virtues, appears from the fact that they say expressly:

> "Works done by unregenerate men, although for the matter of them they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the word of God; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore sinful and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God." (*C. of F.*, Ch. XVI, VII.)

The Commission, I say, conceals the fact that Dr. Smith caricatures the teachings of the Confession of Faith in order to discredit them, and that in order to caricature them, he garbles them.

The Commission also overlooks the fact that the paragraph cited by Dr. Smith is connected with other paragraphs going before and following, and cannot be separated from them without being stripped of its intelligibility. The first paragraph in the sixth chapter speaks of "our first parents." It speaks of the "first sin." Dr. Smith quotes with approval Dr. James Denney when the latter expresses a question whether there was a first man and when he says that we "know nothing about the origin of sin." The same chapter in the third paragraph treats of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, that is, it treats of what is called original sin. And Dr. Smith expressly rejects that teaching of our Confession.

And yet, this Commission, so zealous to obtain Dr. Smith's views: so much concerned to present them with "fidelity to the truth," deliberately suppresses all reference to these statements of Dr. Smith, and even goes the length of saying that such statements do not create a strong presumption that Dr. Smith's teachings in regard to the sinfulness of man are out of accord with our Standards.

(v) Facts Revealed by Sec. II, Par. 5.

The Atoning Work of Christ and Salvation by Faith.

Of these doctrines, which, along with the others mentioned, the Commission considered to be "a fair and sufficient test of a minister's soundness in the faith," the Commission contents itself with saying:

> "We find no place in his writings where he (Dr. Smith) has called in question the doctrines of the vicarious atonement or justification by faith. On the other hand, he states that he not only believes but preaches them in faithfulness." (*Min.*, p. 22.)

Here again it needs to be remembered that the Commission is making statements for the purpose of justifying the conclusion that there is nothing in Dr. Smith's writings to create a strong presumption that in regard to either of these doctrines his teachings are out of accord with those of our Standards. Here again it is

noticeable that the Commission does not permit Dr. Smith to speak for himself on either of these subjects, but speaks for him. It contents itself with saying: "We find no place in his writings where he has called in question the doctrines of the vicarious atonement or justification by faith," and adding, "on the other hand, he states that he not only believes but preaches them in faithfulness." It would have been wise to back up such positive statements by some evidence. The fact that the Commission did not do so of itself creates a strong presumption that it could not do so.

It will be remembered that in his letter of March 17, 1930, to Dr. Smith, the chairman requested of him an expression of his views on the saving power of Christ, and that Dr. Smith replied to said letter on March 21st, giving a statement of his views. This letter was in the hands of the Commission when it drew up its Report. It contains statements of Dr. Smith bearing, at least indirectly, both upon the doctrine of the atonement and upon the doctrine of justification by faith. I shall quote what Dr. Smith says in a moment. But before doing so, I desire to remind the reader of a fact already mentioned, namely, that the information given by Dr. Smith on these matters *was not satisfactory to the Commission itself.* The evidence of this has already been given.

It is only fair to Dr. Smith to note that his statement that I shall in a moment quote was not made in answer to the questions asked in the chairman's letter of April 6, 1930, but to a much less definite request in the chairman's letter of March 17, 1930. The chairman in his letter of March 17, 1930, requested of Dr. Smith an expression of his (Dr. Smith's) views on "the Saving Power of Christ." As these views are given in his own words by Dr. Smith—not put in his mouth by the Commission, it may be as well for us to hear them, even though the Commission did not think it worth while to introduce them into its report. I quote:

> "Let me say that I believe no man in Arkansas Presbytery, or in the Southern Presbyterian Church, has preached Christ and Him crucified more consistently than I have." But it should be observed that to this he immediately adds: "I believe that there is only one thing that makes a man a Christian, and that is, getting into his heart and practicing in his life the spirit of Jesus Christ. I have come to see very clearly that neither

assent nor dissent from any certain theological system is a guaranty of the presence in a man's life of that spirit. The mind of Christ is deeper and finer and more searching than any theological system."

I presume that we will all agree, at least in general, with the closing part of this statement. Our present concern is with its opening sentences and in particular with the second: "I believe that there is only one thing that makes a man a Christian, and that is, getting into his heart and practicing in his life the spirit of Jesus Christ." Dr. Smith does not say that there is one thing and only one that *evidences* the fact that a man is a Christian. What he says is that "there is one thing and only one that *makes* a man a Christian." Those are very different statements. Dr. Smith may have meant to say—he uses language so loosely that I cannot say whether he did or not—that there is one thing and only one thing that evidences the fact that a man is a Christian. That, however, is not what he says.

Again, take the first statement: "Let me say that I believe that no man in Arkansas Presbytery, or in the Southern Presbyterian Church has preached Christ and Him crucified more consistently than I have." Does that mean that Dr. Smith in his preaching has stressed the fact that Christ is the sinner's penal substitute? Does that mean that Dr. Smith holds or teaches that the "Lord Jesus Christ by His perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself, which He through the eternal spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of His Father; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the Kingdom of Heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him?" [*Confession of Faith*, Ch. VIII, V.] The Commission itself was evidently in doubt about this matter. This appears from the fact that the chairman in his letter of April 6th puts the specific question to Dr. Smith concerning the atoning work of Christ: "You believe that He died the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, do you not? You quote Dr. James Denney as expressing your views concerning Christ's person. Does he also express your views in substance on the death of Christ and its meaning?" It is significant that to this more definite question the chairman got no answer.

In his letter of March 21, speaking of what the chairman calls the "saving power of Christ," Dr. Smith says:

> "As to the saving power of Christ. I believe that a man is saved just to the extent in which his life is controlled by the profound and beautiful spirit of the Founder of our religion. Salvation seems to me to be a progressive thing."

Here, again, I think, allowance must be made for Dr. Smith's habitual looseness and vagueness of language. I cannot be certain what is in his mind. Neither was the chairman certain of what was in his mind, because in regard to justification by faith, the chairman in his letter of April 6th seeks a fuller statement from Dr. Smith, and asks him: "You believe also that man's justification is by faith rather than by his own good works, do you not?" To this more definite question the chairman, as I have said, got no answer. But, from the language used by Dr. Smith, it is a fair inference that *he does not believe* in justification by faith. Notice the contrast between the language of Dr. Smith and the language of our Lord. The latter says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth Him that sent me, *hath* eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but *hath passed out of death into life.*" (Jo. 5:24.) Here Christ teaches that salvation is not a progressive thing. Sanctification is a progressive thing, but salvation is assured as soon as one accepts and rests upon Christ.

Note also the contrast between Dr. Smith's language and that of the apostle Paul. "Yea, verily, I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse, that I may gain Christ, and be found in Him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith." (Phil. 3:8, 9.)

Accordingly, our Catechism says: "Justification by faith is an act of God's free grace, whereby He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in His sight, only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and received by faith alone."

And yet, the Commission in its Report says without qualification: "He (that is Dr. Smith) states that he not only believes, but preaches

them (that is the doctrines of the atonement and of justification by faith and presumably the doctrines as they are taught in our Standards) in faithfulness." Here again we find the Commission suppressing the truth and suggesting what is false.

(vi) Facts Revealed by Sec. II, Par. 6. Evolution.

In closing this section of its Report, the Commission says:

> "Dr. Smith is a theistic evolutionist. He believes that evolution was simply the method which God used in bringing the world and its life into existence." (*Minutes*, p. 23, par. 5.)

Here, characteristically, the Commission cites part of what Dr. Smith says and omits the rest, that is to say, it garbles or falsifies Dr. Smith's statements. Despite the fact that he calls himself a theistic evolutionist, Dr. Smith is too intelligent and too honest to conceal the fact that evolution as held by him "necessitates a change of view concerning the historical origin of sin; and this may raise questions as to the essential nature of sin, man's moral accountability, and his need of atonement." (*Evolution and Presbyterianism*, p. 56.) Here again we have an illustration of the Commission's "fidelity to the truth."

A little further along in the same paragraph, the Commission says: "Dr. Smith is no more zealous than other Presbyterian ministers in disavowal of belief of any such doctrines as the damnation of infants or of reprobation by the decree of God." What induced the Commission to make this statement, it is hard to conceive. If it has any meaning at all, this statement implies that in the rumors abroad concerning his doctrinal unsoundness it had been charged that Dr. Smith did not preach the damnation of infants and did not preach reprobation by decree. Why the Commission should have gone out of its way to create so false an impression, it is hard to understand. So far as I know, no one has either alleged or implied that it would be an evidence of doctrinal unsoundness on Dr. Smith's part if he failed to preach the damnation of infants and reprobation by decree. This statement of the Commission seems to have been distated by a desire to say something that would create an impression favorable to Dr. Smith regardless of the fact that it was suited to reflect unfavorably on others.

Our examination of this section of the Report shows:

1. That the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery and Arkansas Presbytery in receiving, approving and adopting the recommendation of the Report of said Commission were guilty of a violation of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., and a betrayal of the confidence reposed in it as its trusted agent by said Church, in that, for the only test known to our Standards, namely "the system of doctrine" set forth in our Constitution, the Commission substituted another and a different test of its own devising—different as to the subject matter of the test, the Commission making it to consist of the doctrines of Scripture, the Deity of Christ, the Sinfulness of man, the Atonement and Justification by faith; and different, in that the Commission did not test Dr. Smith's views even on these doctrines by the statements of our Standards, but (1) by some subjective standard of its own; (2) the opinion supposed to be prevailing at the present time in regard to a doctrine; (3) the action of the Presbytery of Arkansas in 1912.

2. That the Commission sought in its Report to create the impression that there was nothing in Dr. Smith's views touching any of these doctrines that called for further action by the Presbytery of Arkansas, that is to say, that there was nothing in Dr. Smith's views upon any of these doctrines that created a strong presumption that in regard to any of them, Dr. Smith was out of accord with the teachings of our Standards. That, in order to produce this impression, the Commission for the most part called attention only to those aspects of Dr. Smith's views upon the doctrines mentioned that had not been the occasion of the rumors abroad touching Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness, and suppressed what it knew of Dr. Smith's views on all of these doctrines that did create a strong presumption that in reference to them all Dr. Smith is out of accord with the teachings of our Standards. In other words, the Commission struck a blow at the very foundations of veracity by suppressing the truth and suggesting what was false.

iii. FACTS REVEALED BY SEC. III OF THE REPORT.

(i) Facts Revealed by Sec. IIII, Par. 1.

This paragraph reads:

"In conclusion, we would respectfully call the attention of

Presbytery to the fact that Dr. Smith made a clear and straightforward statement of his views and the points of his divergence from the Confession and Catechisms of the Church at the time of his reception into the Presbytery in 1912, and that the Presbytery did not deem his points of divergence as affecting the essential and necessary doctrines of the Church."

The facts here revealed are:

That the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery in 1930 agreed with Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 that Dr. Smith's divergences from our Standards as disclosed in the paper read before the Presbytery of Arkansas in 1912 were not "of the *slightest* importance" and touched "nothing vital." It should be borne in mind that the divergences revealed by Dr. Smith's paper just referred to affected directly or indirectly every one of the following doctrines: the doctrine of Holy Scripture, of God and the Holy Trinity, of God's Eternal Decree, of Creation, of Providence, of the Fall of Man, of Sin and of the Punishment thereof, of God's Covenant with Man, of Christ the Mediator, of Effectual Calling, of Justification, of Saving Faith, of Repentance unto Life, of Good Works, of the Perseverance of the Saints, of the Law of God, of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience, of the State of Man After Death and of the Resurrection of the Dead, and of the Last Judgment.

If, therefore, the judgment of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 and in 1930 is correct, it appears that the larger part of the contents of our doctrinal standards relate to matters that are "not of the slightest importance;" matters in regard to which one may discredit the teachings of the Standards without touching anything "vital;" or, as the Commission phrases it, without "affecting the essential and necessary doctrines of the church."

(ii) Facts Revealed by Sec. III, Par. 2.

This paragraph reads:

"We find that he has not substantially changed his views since then, and that, in our opinion, the points of his divergence from our Standards are not of sufficient character to disqualify him from remaining a minister in good standing in the Southern Presbyterian Church."

The facts here revealed are:

1. That the Commission is mistaken when it affirms that Dr. Smith has not substantially changed his views since then, if by that it means that he has not since then expressed his views more fully and definitely upon certain of the doctrines covered by his paper, and that he has not made statements upon matters other than those mentioned in his paper of 1912 that create a strong presumption that his doctrinal views are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards.

2. That what the Commission had in mind throughout its entire investigation was not the question whether Dr. Smith's statements created a strong presumption that his doctrinal views were out of accord with our Standards, but the very different question—granted, as of course could not be denied, having been admitted by Dr. Smith himself, that his (Dr. Smith's) views are out of accord with the teachings of our Standards—were his divergences either in regard to the doctrines to which they relate or as to their extent, of a kind that would warrant Arkansas Presbytery in deposing Dr. Smith from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church? So that its Report, from its beginning to its close, is a veiled defense of Dr. Smith, and, of course, involved a usurpation of a jurisdiction that did not belong to the Commission.

(iii) Facts Revealed by Sec. III, Par. 3.

This paragraph reads:

> "In view of the foregoing consideration, we make the following answer to the injunction of the General Assembly: 'In compliance with the injunction of the General Assembly in 1929, an investigation has been made by a Commission of Arkansas Presbytery of the rumors that are abroad concerning the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay Watson Smith, and they are found to be without sufficient ground for further action on the part of the Presbytery of Arkansas."

The fact revealed by this section is that the Commission appointed to investigate the rumors abroad concerning Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness was by its blind partisanship and moral cowardice, precipitated into giving utterance to a manifest and inexcusable untruth, in that:

1. As has already been shown, said Commission had in its pos-

session in documentary form, both in the paper that Dr. Smith read before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912, in the writings of Dr. Smith subsequent to that date, and in a letter elicited from Dr. Smith by the Commission itself, evidence suited not only to create a strong presumption of Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness, but evidence which any informed and impartial court would be compelled to recognize as conclusive evidence of Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness. It is not necessary here to rehearse matters that have been fully presented in the preceding part of this paper.

To those mentioned above I shall only add here a single statement of Dr. Smith revelatory of his unsoundness in regard to the doctrine of Scripture. "The chief cause of opposition to the theory of evolution," says Dr. Smith, "is inherited religious belief." Exhibiting "the exact nature of the religious belief here spoken of," Dr. Smith says, "described as the Word of God, a not unnatural assumption is that the Bible must be absolutely true and right in all its teaching, whether of theology, science, history, or ethics." He adds: "Wherever this conception of the Bible prevails, the rejection of the evolutionary theory is a foregone conclusion. The reasoning is logical. It may be reduced to a syllogism . . . . the Bible is the inerrant truth of God; evolution contradicts the Bible; therefore, evolution is not true." Championing the theory of evolution, Dr. Smith says: "Now the validity of this conclusion (that evolution is not true) depends entirely upon the truth of the major premise, namely, that the Bible throughout is an inerrant revelation of truth and righteousness in every detail of theology, science, history, and ethics . . . . " To exhibit what he regards as the invalidity of this major premise, Dr. Smith says of the Scriptures: "If they contain a revelation from God, that revelation came through men, and is conditioned by the character and enlightenment of its human authors. The Bible is both human and divine. It is inspired, but it is not inerrant." (*E. and P.*, pp. 27, 28, 29.)

I am not here concerned with Dr. Smith's argument. There is nothing new about it. Mere repetition does not divest it of its fallacies. It is to the fact revealed by Dr. Smith's statement that attention is asked. It shows that Dr. Smith believes that the Bible may be and is—he does not tell us where or how often—erroneous in its

teachings, not only as to science and history, but as to theology and ethics. The only trouble with Dr. Smith's statement is that it does not go far enough. The theory of evolution—call it theistic, or what you please, necessarily relegates the whole idea of special revelation in any true and proper sense to the limbo of discarded myths.

2. It had in its possession the following additional evidence that Dr. Smith's views are not in accord either with the system of doctrine or principles of government set forth in our Constitution:

(1) The following statements of Dr. Smith:

"Unless such liberty is guaranteed and exercised, then the Southern Presbyterian Church is helplessly bound to a creed written nearly 300 years ago, and the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free becomes a mere form of words without substance or reality." (Sermon, June 9, 1929, col. 2.)

"The doctrinal Standards of the Southern Church, it should be said, were formulated in the middle of the seventeenth century—that is, between 1640 and 1650. Concerning them Dr. McPheters says: 'The Southern Presbyterian Church regards the preservation and propagation of this body of truth in its purity and its entirety as constituting the sole justification for its existence.' This is an amazing statement." (*Comments on Letters of Dr. W. M. McP.* and Dr. J. P. R. p. 3.)

"The phrase 'soundness in the faith' occurs repeatedly in Dr. McPheeters' letter. It is a favorite phrase with traditionalists. By 'sound' Dr. McPheeters does not mean what is meant when we speak of 'sound' health, or 'sound' reasoning, or 'sound' character. He means conformity to seventeenth century thought as set forth in our Standards; and he says that there are rumors that I am not 'sound' in this sense of the word. *The rumors are well founded. I not only am not 'sound' as Dr. McPheeters is, I find it impossible to be so.*" (*Ibid,* p. 5-6.)

"Does the Southern Church exist for the sole purpose of preserving and propagating in their purity and entirety, such seventeenth century conceptions?" (*Ibid,* p. 9.)

Attention is here asked to the fact that the frequency with which Dr. Smith brands the system of doctrine set forth in the Confession as "a seventeenth century creed" emphasizes his dissatisfaction with that creed, and also shows that he finds it unsuited to express his personal beliefs in regard to the doctrines contained in it.

(2) The following statements of Dr. Smith:

"Whenever a body of theological and metaphysical dogmas has been put in the place of, or equated with, the spirit of the Founder of the Christian religion, and wherever the preservation of such dogmas has come to be regarded as the sole purpose of a Church's existence, certain results have invariably followed—truth has been suppressed, freedom has been crushed, intellectual integrity has been compromised, misrepresentations and lies have been circulated, suspicion, intolerance, and hatred have been engendered, ministers have been deposed, churches have been split, and men and women in countless thousands have been imprisoned, tortured, and executed." (*Ibid,* p. 5.) p. 5a.)

"And can Dr. McPheeters discover anything in the words or work of Christ that remotely suggests subscription to an elaborate theological and metaphysical creed as an essential condition of service in the Church's ministry?" (Comments, etc., p. 9.)

Attention is here asked to the fact that the above passages from Dr. Smith's writings justify the conclusion that he regards the teachings of the Confession, looked at as a whole, either as mere human speculations, or as misrepresentations of the teachings of Scripture; that he regards the view that the preservation and propagation of such a creed is the sole purpose of a Church's existence as necessarily resulting in the suppression of truth, the crushing of freedom, the compromising of intellectual integrity, the circulation of misrepresentation and lies, and the engendering of intolerance and hatred.

But our Standards say clearly:

"The sole functions of the Church, as a kingdom and government distinct from the civil sommonwealth, are to proclaim, to administer, and to enforce the law of Christ revealed in the Scriptures." (B.C.O., par 17.) Paul speaks of the Church as "the pillar and bulwark of the truth." (I. Tim. 3:15), thus as Ellicott says: "defining . . . the true note, office and vocation of the Church."

(3) The following statement of Dr. Smith:

"In general it may be said that the Presbyterian standards embody two sets of doctrines. In one set are such doctrines as the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the atonement, justification by faith,

regeneration, sanctification, and so forth. . . . In the other set of doctrines are absolute predestination (issuing in unconditional election, and its corallary, reprobation or preterition), total depravity, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and final perseverance. It is these latter that constitute *distinctive* (italics original) doctrinal Calvinism. . . . As a doctrinal system it is in part static or obsolescent." (*Evolution and Presbyterianism*, p. 75.)

Attention is here asked to the fact that this citation from Dr. Smith's writings makes it plain that he regards the doctrines of unconditional election, total inability, limited atonement, effectual calling, and the final perseverance of the saints as no longer taken seriously by anybody, and certainly not taken seriously by himself. But these doctrines are the very core of what is known as the Reformed Faith. And, the doctrine of "total depravity," (total inability) is simply the doctrine of original sin, as held by the Reformed churches. The latter doctrine lies at the foundation of the Christian system, and will be found in some form in all the great historic creeds.

(4) The following statement of Dr. Smith:

"But does not the Southern Presbyterian Church profess, by virtue of its being a Christian organization, to be governed in all things by the mind and spirit of the Founder of the Church? Is not that absolutely primary and determinative? Whatever its legal rights may be, has the Southern Presbyterian Church a moral or Christian right to do anything that is at variance with that mind and spirit? And can Dr. McPheeters discover anything in the words or work of Christ that remotely suggest subscription to an elaborate theological and metaphysical creed as an essential condition of service in the Church's ministry?" (*Comments, etc.*, p. 9c.)

Attention is here asked to the fact that Dr. Smith could hardly frame a severer and more damaging indictment against the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Standards than that made in the above statement, or against the practice of the Presbyterian Church in requiring the candidates for its ministry to subscribe to its Standards.

(5) The following statements of Dr. Smith:

"And all this has been done, professedly, in the name of One

who reduced religion to two fundamental principles, who never formulated or subscribed to a theological creed." (*Ibid*, etc., p. 5b.)

"I wish to repeat what I said in my sermon. I have never preached anything but the great ethical and spiritual truths of the Bible." (*Ibid.*, etc., p. 7b.)

Attention is here asked to the fact that Dr. Smith has a fundamentally different conception of the gospel from that that is set forth in the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. It is evident that these statements are, and were intended by Dr. Smith to be, an expression of his disapproval of the creed of the Presbyterian Church U. S. as a whole.

(6) The following statements of Dr. Smith:

"I have come to look upon the ordination vow, rigidly interpreted, not only as an anachronism, but as a snare and a curse. It menaces the future integrity of the mind and conscience of the thinking young men who enter our ministry, and it gives to literalists, legalists, and dogmatists, the power of intimidating ministers, whose deepest desire is to serve God and their fellow men through an ever increasing knowledge of truth." (*Prestige and Perquisites*, p. 18.)

"Entire intellectual freedom is impossible in a Church which exists for the sole purpose of preserving and propagating, in its purity and entirety, an elaborate seventeenth century creed, and that binds its ministers to that creed before they know what they really believe. The ordination vow in the Presbyterian Church, rigidly interpreted and enforced, is an anachronism and it is becoming intolerable to the mind and conscience of thinking men." (*Comments*, etc., p. 11.)

Attention is here asked to the fact that the language in which Dr. Smith here expresses his dissatisfaction with and disapproval of an essential part of the system of truth set forth in our Standards is nothing less than a gross affront to the church of which he is a minister.

The record that has been passed in review shows that the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery and said presbytery itself in 1930 repeated the offenses of which said presbytery had been guilty in 1912, namely:

1. It violated the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the

United States and so betrayed the confidence reposed in it as its trusted agent by said Church.

2. It violated its ordination vows in that (1) it substituted for the only test of doctrinal soundness known to our Standards another and different test unknown to them, and in reality no test at all; (2) in that, contrary to its ordination vow [See B.C.O. 136, Ques-6], it did not seek either to maintain the truths of the gospel or the purity and peace of the church, but, on the contrary, treated the great and precious truths of the gospel as matters of not the slightest importance! Matters in regard to which it made no difference whether one did or did not agree with the teachings of our Standards.

3. It struck a blow at the very foundations of veracity in its Report, in that it suppressed the truth and suggested what was false.

These offenses were aggravated by the following considerations:

1. In 1930 Dr. Smith's doctrinal soundness was formally challenged in the public press by persons responsible to their respective presbyteries, whereas such was not the case in 1912.

2. In 1930 the Commission had four months in which to study the evidence in the case and compare it with the teachings of our Standards, whereas in 1912 Arkansas Presbytery heard Dr. Smith's paper and acted upon it at a single session of that body.

3. In 1930 Dr. Smith had himself stated that he was out of accord with and rejected the doctrine of unconditional election and the doctrine of original sin, and when doing so stated explicitly that they were essential doctrines of our Standards: and further had made his dissaisfaction with and antagonism to our doctrinal standards and principles of government perfectly plain: and had gratuitously aspersed the good name of the officers of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and of that church itself.

PART II

THE SITUATION CREATED AND THE ISSUES RAISED BY THE FOREGOING FACTS.

Section I: The Situation

Assuming that the facts in the case have been correctly and fairly stated, what is the situation with which the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. and its constituent Presbyteries find themselves confronted? Summarily stated it is this:

It appears from the record that one of its constituent Presbyteries, namely, Arkansas Presbytery, in 1912 betrayed the trust reposed in it as one of its agents by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. and received into its membership and into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church Dr. Smith, although "Dr. Smith made a clear and straightforward statement of . . . his divergences from the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Church" in regard to the doctrines of Scripture, Creation, the Transcendence of God, Preterition, Man's Total Inability to anything that is spiritually good, Original Sin, the Trinity, and the Person of Christ, and, by necessary consequence, of his divergence from the teachings of our Standards in regard to all other doctrines inseparably connected with those mentioned in the system of doctrine set forth in our Confession and Catechisms:

That in so doing, said Presbytery violated its ordination vows, in that it was not "zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the gospel and the purity and peace of the church:"

That it encouraged and countenanced Dr. Smith in an act that involved him in the guilt of "moral perjury;" that is to say, it encouraged and countenanced him in signing what it speaks of as the *ex animo* declaration, which, as filled out by Dr. Smith, would read: "I, Hay Watson Smith, do sincerely receive and subscribe to the above obligation" (namely, the obligation assumed by an affirmative answer to the questions asked of candidates applying for admission into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.) "as a just and true exhibition of my faith and principles, and do resolve and promise to exercise my ministry in conformity thereto," though Dr.

Smith knew when he signed said obligation, and Arkansas Presbytery knew when it approved its Minutes, that the system of doctrine set forth in the questions asked in ordination was not a just and true exhibition of Dr. Smith's faith:

That Arkansas Presbytery in recording its reception of Dr. Smith garbled, that is to say, falsified its Minutes by omitting all reference to the paper read before it by Dr. Smith setting forth his divergences from the teachings of our Standards; and suggested what was false and what it knew to be false when it approved the record that Dr. Smith "signed the *ex animo declaration*":

That, in thus violating the Constitution, Arkansas Presbytery broke the covenant into which it had entered with its sister Presbyteries, and with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.; that in violating its ordination vows it broke covenant with God, as well as with its sister Presbyteries; and that in both respects its action was a direct blow, not only at the system of truth contained in God's Word and set forth in our Standards, but at the very vitals of veracity itself.

That in 1930 Arkansas Presbytery revived, made the basis of its own action, and so endorsed the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912, thus involving itself in all of the guilt attaching to said action of 1912:

That the investigation of the rumors touching the doctrinal unsoundness of Dr. Smith enjoined upon Arkansas Presbytery by the General Assembly of 1929 was a mere travesty of an investigation, in that the record shows that from beginning to end it was honey-combed with "disreputable and injurious" irregularities, that is to say, irregularities prejudicial to fairness and impartiality; and further characterized by a disregard of the explicit terms of the law under which the investigating Commission was appointed, and the usurpation by said Commission of powers and the affirmation of judgments which, under the Constitution are invested and only competent to in a court conducting a judicial process under all the safeguards by which such process is surrounded in our Constitution, none of which safeguards were observed by the Commission investigating the rumors touching Dr. Smith's doctrinal unsoundness:

That, by thus making a travesty of the investigation enjoined upon

it by the General Assembly, Arkansas Presbytery betrayed the trust reposed in it as its agent by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.:

That the Report of the investigating commission was characterized, from its introduction to the answer to the injunction of the General Assembly set forth in its concluding paragraph and adopted by Arkansas Presbytery, by a suppression of the truth and a suggestion of what was false:

That it violated the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. in that the only test of sound doctrine known to said Constitution was set aside by the Commission, which substituted for it a test of its own devising, which proved to be in its ultimate form nothing other than the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912:

That the statement with which the Commission concludes its Report, namely, that "the rumors that are abroad concerning the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay Watson are found to be without sufficient ground for further action on the part of the Presbytery of Arkansas," is a manifest, inexcusable and a shocking untruth, in that the records show that the Commission had before it evidence sufficient not only to create a strong presumption of the truth of the rumors charging Dr. Smith with doctrinal unsoundness, but evidence which it is safe to say any intelligent and impartial court would have regarded as conclusive evidence of such doctrinal unsoundness on the part of Dr. Smith.

In other words, Arkansas Presbytery in 1930 not only involved itself in the guilt of the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912, but itself repeated under circumstances that greatly aggravated their guilt the very offenses of which Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 had been guilty: that is to say, in 1930 Arkansas Presbytery violated the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. and betrayed the trust reposed in it as its agent by said Church.

It violated its ordination vows, in that it was not zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the gospel, but, on the contrary, practically treated a large proportion of those truths as if they were matters of not the slightest importance, and refused those zealous for the maintaining of those truths any opportunity to maintain them by preferring an indictment against Dr. Smith, affirming,

contrary to the truth, that there was no ground for such indictment:

That Arkansas Presbytery, by thus breaking covenant with its brethren and with God, and garbling its records, struck a blow, not only at the system of truth set forth in our Standards, but at the very vitals of veracity itself.

Such is the situation with which the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. and its constituent Presbyteries find themselves confronted. If we are rightly to appraise and appreciate the gravity of this situation, we shall have to get clearly before us the nature and consequences of covenant-breaking. As to its nature, covenant-breaking involves the dissolution of the bond that binds into an organized whole those who are living under the covenant: in this case the dissolution of the bond that binds together its constituent Presbyteries into the organization known as the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. That bond in every case is not merely a written instrument that we call a Constitution. In the last analysis the bond consists in mutual confidence in one another's fidelity to the written Constitution. Destroy this confidence and the written Constitution will cease to have any binding effect: destroy this confidence and effective cooperation for the common ends for which the organization exists becomes impossible: destroy this confidence, and distrust ensues. Distrust breeds discord, and distrust and discord mean the end of effective cooperation.

And here we need to remember the words of our Lord, when He said: "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees." The characteristic of leaven is that it leavens, that is to say, that it spreads itself through a whole mass. "A little leaven," said the apostle, "leaveneth the whole lump." And, hence, as a matter of self-preservation, he called on those to whom He was speaking to purge out the leaven, lest the whole lump become corrupted by it.

Let us not be deceived. God is not mocked with impunity. If He makes us aware of the presence of evil tendencies, and we go heedlessly along, ignoring their presence, God does not undertake to save us from the consequences of such apathy and indifference in the presence of evil. Nay, it is a marked feature of His providential government that indifference or complacence in the presence of

wrong corrupts and destroys the moral sensibilities and moral sense of those who are thus indifferent and complacent, so that the light that is in them itself becomes darkness. He who fails to see that betrayal of trust by one Presbytery tends to spread itself like an insidious and destructive disease through the whole body, is simply blind to the weaknesses and age-long tendencies of human nature. If Arkansas Presbytery can be a law to itself as to what does and does not constitute doctrinal soundness, then every Presbytery is equally authorized to be a law to itself. If it is permitted to treat this, that and the other doctrine of our system as a matter of no importance, it will not be long until other Presbyteries are found doing the same thing in reference to those or other doctrines.

It is at least conceivable that a re-writing of our Confession of Faith might represent an intelligent, moral earnestness that was determined to conform its profession to its real beliefs. On the other hand, any flouting of the Confession as a whole or of any particular parts of it, any picking and choosing as to what parts of the Confession will be observed and what parts treated as a matter of no importance, indicates an insensibility to the highest and most solemn obligations, that itself constitutes treason to the truth on the part both of those who flout and ignore, and those who stand apathetically by and listen to the flouting and witness the ignoring.

God in His Word repeatedly sets upon covenant-breaking the seal of His sternest disapproval. The reason is obvious, and has already been given. Covenant-breaking means the breaking up of the very foundations of organized life among men. When we cease to be able to trust one another, we go armed either with weapons or with wits that are ceaselessly on the alert for our self-preservation. Happy, fruitful, concerted activity is at an end.

All intelligent and thoughtful men in all countries are appalled as they look back upon the cataclysm known as the World War—a cataclysm that has shaken and threatened with entire destruction the very foundations of what we call civilization. But what were the precipitating causes of that cataclysm? Can they not be summed up in two words—greed and covenant-breaking? Treating solemn covenant obligations when they were supposed to stand in the way

of national ambitions and interests as a mere scrap of paper. We are just beginning, or at least we hope that we are beginning, to recover from a period of depression that has threatened all the material interests and welfare of rich and poor alike. What have been the fundamental causes of that world-wide depression? Can they not be summed up in two words—greed and bad faith? Greed and the betrayal of confidence: greed and the disregard of obligations voluntarily assumed—obligations upon the observance of which depends confidence and cooperation between man and man in every relation in life.

Covenant-breaking between man and man is bad enough. But, in this case, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. is confronted with something even more solemn than a violation of covenant agreements between man and man. It is confronted with the sad, the humiliating fact that one of its Presbyteries has been guilty on a large scale of the violation of solemn ordination vows. What is a vow? Dr. Thornwell says:

> "A vow may be compendiously defined as a promissory oath, using that phrase, not in its common acceptation as a promise to which men are the parties, confirmed by an oath, but as a promise which is at the same time an oath." (*Thornwell's Collected Writings*, Vol. II, p. 572.)

What are its sanctions? Even the moral instincts of the heathen prevented them from misconceptions on this point.

> "So sacred were oaths esteemed among the ancient Romans that they needed no protection from law. The perjured man was simply exposed by the censor, and that was enough. The brand of infamy was upon him, and like the taint of leprosy debarred him from the fellowship of his species and left him to the vengeance of the insulted god." (*Thornwell's Collected Writings*, Vol. II, p. 586.)

But, in the case that we are concerned with, the oath involved in a vow brings the Living God into the transaction.

Speaking of the vow, Dr. Thornwell says:

> "Although primarily it respects God simply as the party to whom a promise is made, yet secondarily, in consequence of His relations to the creature, it must also regard Him as a witness

and a judge. The oath is a solemn invocation of God, in which His name is made the guarantee of the truth of what we say, or, in case of falsehood, in which we deliberately abjure His favour. We suspend our claims to the Divine protection upon our veracity. The peculiarity of its sanction is the reverence for the Divine Being upon which all its sacredness depends. Its peculiar guilt consists in taking the name of the Lord our God in vain." (*Thornwell's Collected Writings*, Vol. II, p. 572.)

Dr. Chas. Hodge expresses the same view in his exposition of the significance of subscription to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. He says:

"The question put to every candidate for ordination in our Church, is in these words: 'Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?' It is plain that a very serious responsibility before God and man is assumed by those who return an affirmative answer to that question. It is something more than ordinary falsehood, if our inward convictions do not correspond with a profession made in the presence of the Church, and as the condition of our receiving authority to preach the Gospel. In such a case we lie not only unto man, but unto God; because such professions are of the nature of a vow, that is, a promise or profession made to God." (*Church Polity*, p. 318.)

As bringing out his sense of the gravity involved in a violation of ordination vows, Dr. Hodge says:

"Should a Romanizing bishop in the Church of England give 'a non-natural' sense to the Thirty-nine articles, that would not acquit the priest, who should sign them in that sense, of the crime of moral perjury; or should a Presbytery give an entirely erroneous interpretation to the Westminster Confession, that would not justify a candidate for ordination in adopting it in that sense. The Confession must be adopted in the sense of the Church, into the service of which the minister, in virtue of that adoption, is received. These are simple principles of honesty, and we presume they are universally admitted, at least so far as our Church is concerned." (*Church Polity*, p. 319.)

Sad and humiliating as is all this, the worst feature of the whole matter has yet to be stated. If a judge in a civil court, or an officer in a bank were to falsify the records of the court or of the bank by suppressing the truth and suggesting what was false, the inevitable

result would be that the judge would be divested of his ermine, put in stripes, and put behind prison bars. And why? Because such violation of trust not only outrages the moral sense of men, but menaces all the interests of society.

Such, then, is the distressful, the humiliating situation with which the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. finds itself confronted as the result of the action of Arkansas Presbytery in 1912, repeated and aggravated in 1930.

SECTION II: ISSUES RAISED

And what are the issues raised by this situation? Are they not clearly these: Can the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., either before God or before man, afford either to ignore or to condone such conduct on the part of one of its constituent Presbyteries? Can it afford to imitate the moral cowardice of Arkansas Presbytery and permit a natural and in itself worthy shrinking from giving pain to its erring brethren to cause it to sacrifice their highest interests, rather than to wound their sensibilities? Discipline is not punishment. It seeks only the good of the offender. It is not discipline but the failure to discipline that evidences a lack of kindness.

Can the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. afford to permit its Constitution and the system of doctrine and principles of government printed and published in that Constitution to be treated as a "scrap of paper?" Can it afford for the impression to go abroad among its Presbyteries that the doctrines of Scripture; of God and the Holy Trinity; of God's Eternal Decrees; of Creation; of Providence; of the Fall of Man, of Sin and of the Punishment thereof; of God's Covenant with Man; of Christ the Mediator; of Effectual Calling; of Justification; of Saving Faith; of the Perseverance of the Saints; of the Assurance of Grace and Salvation; of the Law of God; of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience; of the State of Man After Death and of the Resurrection of the Dead; and of the Last Judgment are matters of not "the slightest importance": that one may discredit more or less, directly or indirectly, any and all of these doctrines without touching anything "vital"? Can it afford to have the impression go abroad that nine-tenths of its ministers and other office-bearers are ignoramuses or hypocrites, pro-

fessing under the sanctions of a solemn vow to believe doctrines, which they know in their hearts that they do not believe? Can it permit what it professes in its "system of doctrine" to believe, namely, that man by the fall became dead in sin and is thereby "utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually," to be caricatured and practically denounced? And its doctrine that God did not leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery, but "having out of His mere good pleasure from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer" [S. C. ques. 20] to be publicly represented as something "medieval and outgrown" in its "conception of God and His relation to mankind?" Can it afford to permit itself to be represented as taking a cruel advantage of unsuspecting and immature young men in requiring them, as a condition of their reception into its ministry, to accept the "system of doctrine" and principles of government to which the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. is formally committed? It is prepared to have the creed to which all of its officers are required to subscribe and have subscribed orally, or both orally and in writing, described as one which it is incredible that Christ would have required anybody to subscribe to in order to service in the ministry of the gospel? Is it prepared to permit its Presbyteries each for itself to determine which and how many of the doctrines in its Standards must, in some sense or other, unknown to anybody but the candidate himself, be accepted, and which and how many of them may be ignored in determining a man's fitness for its ministry? Is it prepared to become an inclusive church: a babel in which every voice will claim to be the voice of the Spirit of God, no matter how divergent and mutually contradictory the voices may be: a church in which the Presbyteries administering the ordination vow and the candidates accepting it will agree together to lie to God, calling Him to witness that they sincerely accept as a just and true exhibition of their own faith a form of words upon which each puts a different interpretation from the other, or which each leaves the other to interpret for himself, regardless of what, in the light of grammatical

and historical interpretation, is the real and intended meaning of the words: to call that a bond of union which in reality is licensed discord: a church that permits its constituent Presbyteries to betray the trust reposed in them, to violate their solemn ordination vows and to strike at the very vitals of truth itself?

These are solemn and searching questions. Let no one suppose that they are mere rhetorical questions. *The fundamental danger of the Church today is treason to truth itself*: the fundamental danger of the Church today is a practical discrediting of the vital importance of a knowledge of and obedience to the truth in order to the salvation and sanctification of souls and the glory of God. Let no one suppose that the members of Arkansas Presbytery are the only presbyters in our church that have treated lightly their ordination vows. The lightness with which those vows are administered and assumed is simply shocking. Let none of our Presbyteries suppose that it can impose vows upon candidates seeking admission to the ministry, and then ignore the fact that it has made itself responsible to God to see to it that the candidate observes the vows that he has taken. The administering and taking of vows is no such one-sided thing. Those who administer them are themselves bound by vows similar to those which the candidate takes. And, if it is a sin for the one taking the vows to ignore them, it is no less a sin for the Presbytery that administered the vows quietly to ignore the fact that the vows it administered have been ignored.

If the church of God is not itself to become a menace to human society, the hour has struck when it must itself awake again to a new sense, a vivid, conduct-controlling sense of the preciousness of truth and of the supreme practical importance of truth. I mean to say, it must awake to a sense of the fact that it is by the truth that men are convicted of sin: that it is by the truth that men are built up in holiness: that no multitude of activities, no matter how good in themselves, can take the place of or be a substitute for the love of the truth in the heart manifested by obedience to truth in the life. The Christian Church might well today appoint a day of humiliation and fasting and prayer for forgiveness in view of its practical indifference to the truth of God: the truth that concerns the honor of God and the salvation of human souls.

Who can be unaware of the fact that the Church's thought today is man-centered and not God-centered. Who can fail to recognize the fact that the Church's main concern today is with man's present interests rather than with his eternal interests; with his ethical rather than his spiritual interests; ignoring the fact that it is the latter that ultimately ground and safeguard the former. How many voices are preaching with the passion of personal conviction the necessity of repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ? Where and by how many is God exalted so that sinners are made aware of their sinfulness and tremble; and saints are filled with a holy awe, and a new peace and hope because God is with them; because they have in Him an eternal refuge, a satisfying portion? Has not the cross of Christ itself become merely a symbol of sacrifice and service on behalf of man, instead of being held up as the supreme manifestation of God's perfections of wisdom, power, justice, holiness and love, and as the measure of the self-abnegation, trust in and devotion to Him that God has aright to expect and does expect in his children? Has not God Himself become a mere stop-gap in human philosophy: a vague speculation, whose actual supernatural manifestation of Himself in the sphere of human history has come to be regarded by multitudes who profess and call themselves Christians as at best but a pleasing myth? Who and how many are engaged in instructing the people of God in the great fundamental truths by which alone the child of God can be convicted, corrected, instructed in righteousness, and made ready to every good word and work? Has not our "practical" religion become just *no religion* at all; but a being careful and anxious about many things, while God Himself is largely forgotten? Is there not great danger that the Spirit of God and His indispensable, supernatural saving work will be forgotten in the techniques and terminology of psychology and religious education?

If the tremendous truths that are in our system of doctrine take hold upon our intelligence, our heart and our conscience, will they not become a fire in our bones, so that we will proclaim them, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear; will not our only concern be to present them with such wisdom and tact, such humility and love, and to reinforce our presentation of them by a

life of such reverence toward God and unselfish service of men, as will commend them to every man's conscience.

The trouble with the Church today, so far as I have been able to diagnose it, is that it has been so nearly asphyxiated by the fetid atmosphere of naturalism, which it inhales with every breath, that it is dazed and for the most part blindly groping to find something that will justify its existence upon a purely naturalistic world view. If the sin of our brethren of Arkansas Presbytery reminds all of us of *our own sins,* and brings all of us as well as them to our knees in genuine repentance before God, it will be another glorious manifestation of God's power to overrule even the sins and follies of His people for His own glory and for their salvation. If in seeking in Christian love and humility to bring our brethren of Arkansas Presbytery to a just sense of the grievousness of their sin, we fail to humble ourselves before God for our own, it will be nothing short of a catastrophe. The sooner we face these facts, bitter and humbling though they be, the better it will be for us.

In the love of my brethren; in the interests of the Truth; and in the fear of God. Amen.

W. M. McPheeters.

Decatur, Ga.,
March 17, 1934.

APPENDIX A.

REPORT OF COMMISSION OF ARKANSAS PRESBYTERY INVESTIGATING THE RUMORS CONCERNING REV. HAY WATSON SMITH.

[21]

The Commission appointed at the fall meeting of Arkansas Presbytery to investigate the rumors as to the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay Watson Smith herewith presents its report:

I. Principles of Procedure.

Bearing in mind that we are under the sacred obligation to maintain the purity and peace of the Church, and that the power which Christ has given the Church is for building up and not for destruction, we have endeavored to make the investigation in fidelity to the truth, in fairness to Dr. Smith, and in a way that would promote the honor of the Church.

The duty of the Presbytery in this matter, as we see it, is two fold: First, to see that no essential doctrine of the Gospel is denied; and, second, to see that no man's liberty in Christ is infringed.

The investigation has been made upon the basis of Dr. Smith's sermons, pamphlets, and written statements, especial attention being given to his statement before the Presbytery at the time of his recep-
[22]
tion in 1912. These writings of Dr. Smith represent his views, they form the basis of the rumors, and we have endeavored to test them by the Scriptures as they are interpreted in the doctrinal standards of our Church. In addition to this, we have had frequent correspondence with Dr. Smith and have taken pains to find out more fully than his writings reveal what his views on the great doctrines of our Church really are.

II. Essential Doctrines.

We concerned ourselves especially with Dr. Smith's views respecting the Deity of Christ, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Sinfulness of Man, the Atoning Work of Christ and Salvation by Faith. These doctrines we consider a fair and sufficient test of a minister's soundness in the faith.

On many occasions Dr. Smith has affirmed his belief in the Deity

of Christ. In his statement before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 he said: "I believe in the Father, and the Son and in the Holy Spirit; and I believe that Christ was Son of Man and Son of God—human and divine." In a letter he says that the sum and substance of his Theology and his Christology is this: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."

Concerning the Scriptures, Dr. Smith believes that they are the inspired revelation of God's will and character. He does not believe in the verbal infallibility or in the inerrancy of the Bible, but he affirms that it is the essential word of God to man.

Dr. Smith objects to the doctrine of total depravity as it is stated in Chapter 6, Section 4 of the Confession, but he says: "IF by total depravity were meant that the effects of sin are felt in every part of man's nature—total meaning throughout the whole extent of—there would be nothing to object to in the doctrine." He believes that man is a sinner by nature and by practice and that he is utterly unable to save himself.

We find no place in his writings where he has called in question the doctrines of the Vicarious Atonement or Justification by Faith. On the other hand, he states that he not only believes but also preaches them in faithfulness.

Dr. Smith is a Theistic Evolutionist. He believes that evolution was simply the method which God used in bringing the world and its life into existence. The doctrine of total depravity to which Dr. Smith finds no objection we believe to be in line with what is now believed and taught in the Church. The mind of the Church with reference to the electing love of God and the salvation of infants has been clearly and emphatically stated. "Those who die in infancy, and others who are incapable of exercising choice, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit who works when and where and how he pleases. Thus we declare that God's electing grace has peopled heaven with a multitude which no man can number and has never sent one soul to hell." Minutes of Assembly, 1913, page 44. Dr. Smith is no more zealous than other Presbyterian ministers in the disavowal of belief in any such doctrines as the damnation of infants or of reprobation by the decree of God.

III. Conclusion.

In conclusion, we would respectfully call the attention of Presbytery to the fact that Dr. Smith made a clear and straightforward statement of his views and the points of his divergence from the Confession and Catechisms of the Church at the time of his reception [23]
into the Presbytery in 1912, and that the Presbytery did not deem his points of divergence as affecting the essential and necessary doctrines of the Church.

We find that he has not substantially changed his views since then, and that, in our opinion, the points of his divergence from our Standards are not of sufficient character to disqualify him from remaining a minister in good standing in the Southern Presbyterian Church.

In view of the foregoing considerations, we make the following answer to the injunction of the General Assembly: "In compliance with the injunction of the General Assembly in 1929 an investigation has been made by a Commission of Arkansas Presbytery of the rumors that are abroad concerning the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay Watson Smith, and they are found to be without sufficient ground for further action on the part of the Presbytery of Arkansas."

Respectfully submitted,

REV. M. A. BOGGS,
REV. C. M. CAMPBELL,
REV. S. J. PATTERSON,
ELDER JNO. R. HAMPTON,
DR. E. R. LONG, (Per M. A. B.)

Dissenting Members—

REV. A. KILLOUGH,
REV. J. E. McJUNKIN.

Presbytery by a vote of 24 to 4 received the report.

Protests were entered as follows:

The undersigned offers the following reasons for his dissent from the report, of the Commission appointed by the Arkansas Presbytery to investigate the rumors concerning the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay Watson Smith, made at Presbytery, April 9, 1930.

Reasons:

(1) That in performing the duties assigned by the Presbytery, the Commission merely expressed an opinion concerning the soundness of the faith of Dr. Smith, instead of making an investigation to ascertain the facts as to his BELIEFS in regard to the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church U. S., as was contemplated in the instructions of Presbytery.

(2) That no investigation was made. Dr. Smith was not required to appear before the Commission for questioning or examina-
[24]
tion, which is the only way to investigate a matter. A few of his pamphlets were read and discussed in an indefinite way, the conclusions of which were made the basis of the report. Only four questions, worded in a general way, were addressed to him by the chairman without the advice of the Commission, and were answered by Dr. Smith in a manner that did not convey the information sought. (The Commission did not word the questions.)

(3) That the Commission was guided by the supposed views of the Church on the doctrines under consideration rather than by the Standards of the Presbyterian Church U. S. In other words the Commission endeavored to test the soundness in the faith of Dr. Smith in the light of the assumed position of the church on these matters, instead of finding out what his beliefs were, and how they conformed to the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the denomination.

Respectfully submitted,

J. E. McJUNKIN.

"The undersigned member of Presbytery most respectfully dissents from the findings of the Commission, in the matter of Dr. Hay Watson Smith, for the following reasons:

"(1) That in his opinion, no adequate examination of Dr. Smith was had by and before the Commission; in fact, according to the report of the Commission, Dr. Smith was never before the Commission;

"(2) If an examination of Dr. Smith were had, by the Commission, no record thereof was presented to Presbytery."

J. F. LAWSON.

We, the undersigned, wish to go on record as dissenting from the report of the majority of the Commission appointed to investigate the rumors concerning the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay W. Smith, D.D., on the ground that sufficient facts were not gathered in the investigation on which to base the report and in our judgment sufficient means were not allowed for securing said facts.

REV. ALGERNON KILLOUGH,
REV. J. P. STEVENSON,
REV. J. P. SNIPES.

I wish to protest against the report on the ground that in my opinion there was no adequate examination of Dr. Hay Watson Smith by and before the Commission of Arkansas Presbytery.

REV. W. S. LACY.

APPENDIX.

[25]

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION OF ARKANSAS PRESBYTERY APPOINTED TO INVESTIGATE THE RUMORS CONCERNING THE SOUNDNESS IN THE FAITH OF DR. HAY WATSON SMITH.

After three or four months of individual study of Dr. Smith's writings, the articles of those calling his orthodoxy in question, the doctrines of the Church involved, and Presbyterian law and procedure in such cases, the Commission came together in Little Rock for a two-day sesison, March 24-25, 1930.

Rev. Charles M. Campbell was elected Clerk and the meeting opened with prayer by all present.

The following principles of procedure was agreed upon:

First: *As to the nature of our work.* We are to make an investigation, not conduct a trial. We are not commissioned to challenge Dr. Smith's views, but to ascertain what they are and then to decide whether, in our opinion they are in accord with essential Presbyterianism. Par. 183, Book of Church Order.

Second: *As to the end and purpose of all discipline.* The authority of the church is for building up and not tearing down. We are to safeguard both the peace and purity of the church. Question 6 of ordination vow.

Third: *As to the two great Principles to be guarded:*

1. That no essential truth of the gospel be denied.
2. That no man's liberty in Christ be infringed.

Fourth: Liberty of Opinion on matters not considered vital to the System of Doctrine recognized. (a) God alone the Lord of Conscience. Confession of Faith, chapter 20, p. 2. (b) Liberty not to be abused. Confession of Faith, ch. 20, p. 4. (c) We subscribe to confession and catechisms as containing the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scriptures. Agreement on every point not necesary. Adopting Act of 1729.

Fifth: *As to what constitutes an offense.* Nothing except that which can be proven such from Scripture as interpreted by the Standards. Par. 173, Book of Church Order.

Sixth: *As to the Commission's jurisdiction.* Shall we work as Committee or Commission? After much discussion decided to work as a Commission and bring recommendations to Presbytery if we think it wise.

[26]

The first hour was spent in a general discussion of the literature in hand and of other possible means of evidence with Rev. McJunkin calling attention to certain paragraphs on certain pages in Dr. Smith's pamphlet on "Evolution and Presbyterianism." Rev. J. E. McJunkin offered a resolution which after discussion was lost.

The following resolution, with questions attached, offered in the first meeting of the Commission, March 24, 1930, by Rev. J. E. McJunkin:

Resolution As a Form of Procedure.

Resolved that, as the form of procedure on the part of the Commission appointed by the Arkansas Presbytery "to investigate the rumors that are abroad as to the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay Watson Smith, D.D.," the following questions be submitted to him in writings for his answers, which shall be made in writing, and

that in case the answers are not clear they be re-submitted to him for his clarification, and that said answers constitute the basis of the report and recommendation of the Commission to the Spring Meeting of Presbytery.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED.

The Holy Scriptures.

1. Do you accept the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice?

2. Do you accept them as the word of God in full, or as merely containing the word of God?

3. Do you believe and teach that the Bible contains historical and scientific errors?

4. What do you understand as to the doctrine of inspiration as outlined in our Standards?

5. Do you believe that God communicated His truth and will to us through the agency of human authors or writers, and that the validity or authority of this truth depends on the character, limitations and intelligence of the authors, or that God overruled these limitations and gave His will and truth to us?

The Doctrines of Creation.

1. Do you believe in a fiat creation, that God brought into existence all things by the word of His power; in other words, that He created all things of nothing, "and all very good?"

[27]

2. Do you believe that God created man male and female, after His own image, with knowledge, righteousness and holiness, and with dominion over the creatures; and do you believe that man as thus created was perfect in all his powers of mind, of body and of spirit? Do you understand by this that the law of God was written upon the heart and that he had power to fulfill it?

3. Do you accept the doctrine that man was made free, and that he had power not to sin, thus rendering him a responsible agent, fully accountable to God for his own conduct; and do you accept the teachings of our Standards that we are descended from our first parents by ordinary generation, and that Adam was both our natural and federal head?

The Doctrine of the Fall.

1. Do you believe that by the fall our first parents lost communion with God, that they lost their original righteousness, and so became dead in sin, wholly defiled in the faculties of soul and body?

2. As a result of this sin were they left helpless and indisposed to all good, and altogether inclined toward evil?

3. Are we by virtue of our natural descent from the original pair made liable for their sins, and thus left under condemnation of death for the sin imputed to us? And do you accept the teachings of Scripture, namely, that by the sin of Adam death came upon all the race descending from him?

The Holy Trinity.

1. Do you accept the doctrine of God and the Trinity as taught in our Standards, namely, that there is but one living and true God who is infinite in all His being, dwelling above and apart from the works of His hand, with no essential manifestation of his being in the natural world or material universe?

2. Do you believe that His will is immutable, and that for His own glory He has decreed whatsoever comes to pass; that he is holy in His nature, full of truth and goodness, yet is one who hates sin, and will punish man for sin, and will by no means clear the guilty save in Christ?

3. Do you accept the position of our church concerning the nature of God the Father, that He is a person, and not a mere force in the universe?

4. Who (what?) do you understand by the doctrine of the unity of the Godhead, as possessing three persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, all of the same substance, equal in power and glory? Do you believe the Son to be the Only Begotten of the Father, and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son?

[28]

5. Do you believe that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and that He was born of her, and is therefore very God of very God as well as man? Do you accept the doctrine of the Virgin birth as set forth in the Confession of Faith? Do you preach the Deity of Christ?

The Resurrectoin of Christ.

1. Do you hold that Christ was crucified, that He died on the cross, was buried, and on the third day rose again from the dead with the selfsame body in which He suffered, and that He ascended on high and now sitteth at the right hand of the Father making intercession for us, and will come again to judge the world?

2. Do you accept Paul's teachings that if Christ be not raised from the dead, then is your faith vain and you are still in your sins?

The Atoning Work of Christ.

1. Do you believe that Jesus Christ by the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself—has fully satisfied divine justice, and purchased reconciliation to God and an everlasting inheritance for true believers?

2. Do you believe that there is no salvation apart from the substitutionary atonement of Christ? If so, you therefore accept the doctrine of imputation taught in the New Testament, that, as by the disobedience of one man sin came upon all men, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous?

The Doctrine of Election.

1. Do you hold that God foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, and that according to the counsel of His will He may accomplish His purpose without the intervention of second causes; also that in the execution of His decrees He leaves man to the freedom of his will, thus making him accountable for his own conduct?

2. Do you accept the Doctrine of the Confession of Faith in regard to election, which teaches that God, for the praise of His glorious grace, does elect some angels and men to everlasting life, and leaves others to suffer just punishment for their sins: in other words that He foreordains some men and angels to death.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

1. Do you believe the Lord's Supper is for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ in death, and that it points us to Christ who died once for all for the sins of the whole world?

2. Do you accept baptism as the symbol of the regenerating

power of the Holy Ghost in conversion; also that the application [29]
of water represents the descent of the Holy Ghost which is essential to the new birth of the believer?

The Commission then resolved to proceed with the investigation upon the basis of Dr. Smith's written statements, especially his statement before Arkansas Presbytery in 1912 and that they be tested according to the doctrinal standards of the Church.

Questions discussed:

1. Deity of Christ. (Passed for the time being.)
2. Scriptures.

(a) Inspiration. Here attention was directed to pages 28-29-40-46-47-50-53 and 56 of Evolution and Presbyterianism, and pages 2 and 6 of Some Facts About Evolution. Dr. Boggs read a statement from Alexander's Digest, page 7. After much discussion of the subject, Dr. Patterson offered the following resolution which was passed with a vote of three to two.

The resolution:

Resolved that in regard to the Scriptures, we find that Dr. Smith is somewhat liberal in the matter of interpretation and opinion and goes in certain particulars beyond the orthodox views of the Church, yet it is our judgment that the issue does not justify judicial process.

Rev. McJunkin stated that he was opposed to this resolution and reserved the right to submit a minority report.

3. Reprobation: This was passed by for future consideration.

4. Total depravity: After considerable discussion on this point, Dr. Patterson stated that he could not remain longer with the Commission at this date and was given permission to cast his vote against any censure of Dr. Smith for his views on total depravity.

A motion was then made and carried that the Chairman and the Clerk of the Commission be appointed a Committee of two to draft tentative report to be presented to Commission before the meeting of Presbytery.

A motion was made that the Commission recess until April 7th at seven o'clock at which time the tentative report would be heard and if Commission deemed it necessary it would ask Dr. Smith to appear before it at that time.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COMMITTEE OF TWO AT HOT SPRINGS, ARKANSAS, APRIL 1, 1930.

[30]

Rev. M. A. Boggs, Chairman, and Rev. C. M. Campbell, Clerk, met in the pastor's study of the First Presbyterian Church, Hot Springs, for the purpose of drafting a tentative report of the Commission in session at Little Rock, and the idea expressed by the majority. Questions were also to be asked by the Chairman on the following points:

The Inspiration of the Scriptures.

The Sinfulness of Man.

The Atoning Work of Christ.

Salvation by Faith.

(See correspondence for questions and Dr. Smith's answers.)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COMMISSION AT OSCEOLA, ARKANSAS, APRIL 8, 1930.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. J. E. McJunkin. Dr. Boggs read letters from Dr. Smith answering the questions referred to above and further explaining his position. He also read a letter from Dr. Long explaining his position and stating that he could not be present on account of Mrs. Long's illness. He then read a telegram from Dr. Long endorsing the tentative report in substance.

The chairman read the tentative report as drafted by the committee of two and on motion it was carried seriatim.

The result of this consideration is as follows:

The Report.

Section One:

Paragraph one carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph two carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph three struck out. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph four carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

First section passed as amended. Voting 3, not voting 2.

A motion was made to reconsider the action taken at Little Rock

declaring that we were a Commission and report as a Committee lost. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Section Two:

Paragraph one carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph two carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

[31]

Paragraph three carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph four carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph five carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph six carried as deleted. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph seven carried as deleted. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Section two accepted as a whole with deletions. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Conclusion section three.

Paragraph one carried. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph two carried as changed. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Paragraph three.

In view of the foregoing considerations we make the following answer to the injunction of the General Assembly: "In compliance with the injunction of the General Assembly of 1929 an investigation has been made by a Commission of Arkansas Presbytery of the rumors that are abroad concerning the soundness in the faith of Rev. Hay Watson Smith and they are found to be without sufficient ground for further action on the part of Arkansas Presbytery." Carried as given above; voting 3, not voting 2. The report was then adopted as a whole as changed and deleted. Voting 3, not voting 2.

Presbytery's Commission consisted of seven men, five ministers and two ruling elders. The quorum of the Commission was five. At each meeting of the Commission six members were present.

APPENDIX B.—LETTER OF STATED CLERK, J. A. HANNA.

Little Rock, Ark., March 17, 1930.

My dear Mr. Killough:

I am enclosing the copy I made from the Minutes of Arkansas Presbytery regarding the Hay Watson Smith matter. This was all

there was in the Minutes that I could find bearing on the case. I trust it may be of some help to you. I think C. M. Campbell took off a copy of this. I do not know that I will have any need of it so you needn't return it, but it might be well to preserve it for future reference.

Was mighty glad to see you again and hope your work goes well and that this troublesome case may be settled in a way that will be for the best interests of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. HANNA, Stated Clerk.

Minutes of Presbytery In Re.
Rev. Hay Watson Smith, D.D.

Batesville, Ark., November 15, 1911.

Adjourned Meeting.

"The Rev. Hay Watson Smith of the Congregational Church, who is filling the pulpit of the Second Presbyterian Church, Little Rock, being present, was introduced and invited to sit as a visiting brother, and granted the privileges of the floor."

"The Session of the Second Church gave reason for non-representation at the Stated Fall Meeting of Presbytery at Blytheville and asked permission to supply the pulpit till Fall Meeting of 1912. Rev. Hay Watson Smith made a full statement to the Presbytery as to his relation to the Second Church. The Presbytery granted the request of the Second Church."

Cotton Plant, Ark., Spring Meeting, April 17, 1912.

Communications. "A call from the Second Presbyterian Church, Little Rock for the pastoral services of the Rev. Hay Watson Smith, which was referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures."

Third* Day, April 18. "The Rev. Hay Watson Smith of Manhattan Association of New York, was introduced to the Presbytery and invited to sit as visiting brother."

"Committee on Bills and Overtures."

Fourth* Day. "That the call from the Second Church, Little Rock, for the pastoral services of Rev. Hay Watson Smith be lodged in the hands of the Stated Clerk." "Rev. Hay Watson Smith of Manhattan

*Note—This is evidently a mistake in copying.

Association came before the Presbytery and was examined according to the Book of Church Order. His examination was sustained. Rev. A. F. Cunningham was excused from voting. Mr. Smith was received and signed the Ex. Animo Declaration, and his name was enrolled." "The call of the Second Presbyterian Church, Little Rock, was placed in his hands and was accepted by him. Presbytery appointed Rev. H. W. Smith and J. S. Pollock a committee to arrange for installation services."

Afternoon. "Presbytery reconvened and proceeding with the regular order of the day, heard a sermon from the Rev. Hay Watson Smith from the text Dan. 6:10. Committee to arrange installation report. Rev. J. F. McKenzie to precide, preach and propound the questions. Rev. John Van Lear to charge the pastor; Elder W. D. Ball, Central Church, to charge the congregation. Time, 3rd Sabbath in May." "Committee on installation reports work done by full committee. Committee discharged."

APPENDIX C—THE RECORD.

The record of the case so far as the present paper is concerned would include the following documents:

Minutes of Spring Meeting of Arkansas Presbytery, April 8-9, 1930, contains *Minutes of the Commission* appointed to investigate the rumors abroad concerning the soundness in the faith of the Rev. Hay Watson Smith, and *Report of said Commission.*

Correspondence between the chairman of said Commission and the Rev. Hay Watson Smith:

Dec. 9, 1929, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
Dec. 17, 1929, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
January 7, 1930, letter from Mr. Boggs to Dr. Smith.
January 10, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
January 16, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
January 28, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
February 1, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
February 24, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
March 12, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.
March 17, 1930, letter from Mr. Boggs to Dr. Smith.

March 18, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.

March 19, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.

March 21, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.

April 5, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs.

April 6, 1930, letter from Mr. Boggs to Dr. Smith.

April 7, 1930, letter from Dr. Smith to Mr. Boggs, and other letters referred to in the above correspondence, but not filed with the Stated Clerk of the Synod of Arkansas.

PAMPHLETS:

Comments on the Letters of Dr. W. M. McPheeters and Dr. J. P. Robertson, by Dr. Hay Watson Smith.

A Reply to a Communication of Rev. Hay Watson Smith, by W. M. McPheeters.

Open Letter to Dr. Hay Watson Smith, dated Aug. 16th, 1929, by Dr. J. P. Robertson.

**Prestige and Rerquisites,* by Dr. Hay Watson Smith.

Evolution and Presbyterianism, by Dr. Hay Watson Smith.

Some Facts About Evolution, by Dr. Hay Watson Smith.

To which may be added the following communications in the public press:

Sermon by Dr. Smith preached on June 9th, 1929, and appearing in the *Arkansas Gazetter* of June 10th, 1929.

Communication by W. M. McPheeters in *The Columbia State* of Sept. 22, 1929.

*Communications by Dr. Smith in *The Arkansas Gazette* of April 14th and 27th, respectively, 1930.

Communication by the Rev. M. A. Boggs in *The Arkansas Gazette,* May 10th, 1930.

*Communication by the Rev. N. Smylie in *The Arkansas Gazette,* April 26th, 1930.

*Article by A. P. dated Nov. 13th, 1929, appearing in *The Atlanta Journal.*

*Article in *The Arkansas Gazette,* dated Nov. 15th, 1929, headed "Dr. Smith's Faith Will Be Probed."

N. B.—All of the above documents, except such as are preceded by an asterisk, are part of the official record placed in the hands of the Stated Clerk of Arkansas Presbytery in connection with the complaint of Messrs. Killough and McJunkin.

The documents marked with an asterisk have been included as part of the record on the basis of the definition of "the record of the case" given, BCO, par. 227. This reads: "All the proceedings in connection with the case, including the notice of appeal and reason therefor, the evidence, *any papers bearing on the case* (italics mine) . . . . . shall be known as 'the record of the case.'"

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY-PSCE
3 2146 00504 9575

Dennis Lindsey Printing Co., Inc., Decatur, Ga.